IN THE LIGHT OF REASON

L. J. CORRIGAN

Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE
REVERENDS CHARLES ROSENBURY ERDMAN
D.D., LL.D.

BP955
.C785

FEB 27 1902
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Christian Science in the Light of Reason

By
L. J. COPPAGE

CINCINNATI
The Standard Publishing Company

Copyright, 1914, by
L. J. Coppage

The Standard Press

PREFACE

It has been said that they who dwell in the tabernacle of Wisdom must banish passion, prejudice and sloth. May it not be said with equal propriety that he who abides within the domain of Science must renounce egotism, bigotry and inordinate partisan zeal, whether social, political or religious?

No substantial and permanent contribution to scientific research was ever made by him who repels all inference not drawn from his own personal experience, ignores all truth except that which may be made to serve his purpose, or exalts sentiment over syllogism, rhetoric over reason, or impulse over obvious inference in forming the convictions which are to determine his course in life.

Every solution worthy to be called scientific is based on fundamentals; and every problem, institution or cult bears the same relation to its basic principle that a superstructure does to its foundation—destruction of the one involving the collapse of the other.

It has, therefore, been the aim of the writer of these pages to ascertain the postulates which serve as bases for the so-called Christian Science doctrines, and subject them to the scrutiny of a rigid analysis. If they be found scientific, congruent and Scriptural, we should promptly yield assent, an-

nounce allegiance and conform conduct thereto. If unscientific, they should be rejected by the wise and learned; if unscriptural, repudiated by the devout, and if incongruous, renounced by all who lay claim to candor and sincerity even among the adherents of the cult itself.

The considerations which move men to enter the field of controversy are numerous as they are variant. Ambition, gain, partisan zeal, inherent combativeness, patriotism, and, I am persuaded, love of truth, regardless of the simple, and sometimes unpopular and unattractive, garb in which she appears. The writer hereof believes the last named should be the sole motive in all moral and religious investigations; nor is he aware of being impelled by any other in undertaking this most certainly unprofitable and unthankful task. With the shadows fast lengthening toward the twilight of declining years, profit or preferment would seem beyond expectation; and the only remaining inducement would appear to be the solemn conviction that Truth is being profaned within her own temple—assaulted in the house of her professed friends.

Moved solely by such consideration, this work should be free from offensive epithet, exasperating innuendo and sarcastic crimination; and as such have found no place in the thoughts of the writer during its execution, he ventures to hope that it will be found void of offense, even to those who fail to reach his conclusions. In fact, it has been his aim, by clearness, courtesy and exactness, to place the work beyond misunderstanding, resentment or refu-

tation. If failure, rather than success, in this line has been attained, it is due to unwisdom, not malice.

An objection not unfrequently urged to works of this kind is that they are iconoclastic—negative and destructive in character, rather than affirmative —constructive. For the purpose of discrediting such work is sometimes invoked the maxim, "Build your own house, but don't pull down your neighbor's." But one is not engaged in destroying his neighbor's individual structure who simply addresses him through the ordinary channels of information, calling attention to the unsanitary and dangerous character of materials being imposed on the building public.

If he kindly and courteously give his reasons for discrediting certain types of houses and certain brands of material, leaving it entirely optionary with each individual whether to heed or ignore his suggestions, the maxim is irrelevant, because it fails at the very point of analogy; viz., imposition, constraint.

The true scientist craves no such immunity from the scrutinizing eye of reason. With him the form of the proposition is not so important as its truth or falsity.

The commands of the Bible are well varied between affirmative and negative—constructive and destructive—commendation and denunciation. Of the Decalogue, eight of the ten are negative.

Abstract doctrines, however, are but barren idealities except as they crystallize into convictions, thereby determine conduct, and thus develop character. Good and commendable character, therefore,

is but the sum of good and commendable thought and action, which result no otherwise but through correct teaching—doctrine; Latin, *docere,* to teach.

The importance, therefore, of both *ex*posing and *op*posing erroneous doctrines is obvious, because, if believed and acted on, they result in defective character, the fruitful parent of failure, suffering and disaster.

If there are better means of distinguishing between wholesome and vicious teachings than careful, patient, courteous and considerate examination of the basis on which they rest and the relation which they bear to truth, it is unknown to this scribe. But the incentive should be rather to weigh and determine than to discredit and denounce. We believe not one sound principle may be invoked in favor of immunity from examination because a proposition has been adopted as a tenet of some moral or religious cult.

It would place beyond the mild influence of moral suasion polygamy, human sacrifices, self-immolation, self-destruction—yea, and promiscuous concubinage, if practiced by religious sanction. Yet zealots there be who break the vials of their religious wrath on the defenseless head of any one who presumes to suggest, in the most courteous manner, the erroneous, untenable, or even dangerous character of their dogmas. They shout, "Iconoclast! Pulling down his neighbor's house!"

The word "iconoclast" is from the Greek *eikon,* an idol or image, and *klastes,* a breaker or destroyer. It is used to denote a destroyer of false dogmas as

well as false gods or idols. He is no stranger to either Old or New Testament history, and is almost invariably commended. Among the number we find Moses, Elijah, Christ, John the baptizer, the apostles, Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Wesley, Campbell, and many other ancient and modern reformers, all of whom abounded in didactics of the negative, destructive or iconoclastic order. It was the maker, builder or constructor of false doctrines or idols who was subjected to universal divine denunciation in the sacred volume; such were the kings Jeroboam, Ahab and Manasseh, and the Ephesian silversmiths, to whom may be added more recent religious leaders, as will be shown in the body of this work.

The true function of the modern reformer is the ascertainment and dissemination of truth, which also includes the exposure of error, especially such error as is destructive of the welfare of society. Any religious cult which is too cowardly to face, or too imperious to tolerate, courteous and judicious criticism constitutes a menace to free institutions.

But of all religious cults known to this scribe, our Christian Science friends inveigh against destructive didactics with the least consistency.

They are of all the most iconoclastic. In a subsequent part of this work we will show their doctrines to be destructive of the great fundamental fact on which the Christian religion rests; and also that they leave no basis or postulate for a logical conclusion of any kind.

Throughout this work the personal equation has been ignored. The alleged plagiarizing of the Chris-

tian Science doctrines from Dr. Quinby, the author's tutor; her miraculous recovery from a fatal accident; domestic infelicity consequent on her somewhat numerous matrimonial ventures—are all difficult to prove or disprove, and, in any event, tend to provoke rather than convince.

For reasons not necessary to state, we have not capitalized the pronouns representing Deity, thus following the example of the King James translators rather than that of later scholars.

In some instances we have inserted the word "Christian" or the letter "C" before the word "Science" in our quotations; and we have enclosed it in parentheses to indicate that it originally formed no part of the quotation. It is so inserted to indicate that the word "Science" was used in the sense of Christian Science as set forth in the Christian Science text-book; and that the author so intended, when capitalized, sufficiently appears from the following quotations from the Christian Science text-book, from page 127, lines 9 to 13, and page 471, lines 29 to 31. Our manner of so indicating is as follows:

127:9-13. "The terms Divine Science, Spiritual Science, Christ Science or Christian Science, and Science alone, she (the author) uses interchangeably, according to the requirements of the context. These synonymous terms," etc.

471:29, 30, 31. "Her highest creed has been divine Science, which, reduced to human apprehension, she has named Christian Science."

Let it be kept well in mind during the perusal of

this work that when the word "Science" (capitalized) is used in or quoted from the Christian Science text-book, it was intended by the author to mean her system as set forth therein and by her called "Christian Science."

That we have sometimes used the term "Christian Science," without the qualifying prefix, *so called,* must not be taken as a concession that the name is appropriate, or that its doctrines are either scientific or Christian. In this we are simply accommodating ourself to the author's phraseology.

These lectures were first delivered at St. Petersburg, Florida, a thriving and attractive city on Tampa Bay, at a time when there were probably ten or twelve thousand tourists spending the winter therein; and it was at the solicitation and under the auspices of the Ministerial Association of said city, consisting of the resident and tourist clergymen from perhaps every State in the Union. A copy of the resolutions adopted by said association upon the occasion is hereto appended.

May the writer of these pages venture to indulge the hope that they may prove helpful to some earnest seeker for truth along the lines therein treated.

Crawfordsville, Indiana. L. J. COPPAGE.

[From the Crawfordsville *Journal,* April 18, 1912.]

MADE FINE IMPRESSION.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, PRAISES L. J. COPPAGE.

Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Coppage have been spending the winter in St. Petersburg, Florida, and while

there Mr. Coppage delivered a number of lectures. The *Independent,* a daily paper published at St. Petersburg, recently published the following complimentary resolutions regarding three of these lectures:

"WHEREAS, The Hon. L. J. Coppage has delivered three lectures on the subject of Christian Science, in a courteous and charitable spirit; and

WHEREAS, He has conclusively shown that Christian Science is neither Christian nor scientific, nor self-consistent; therefore,

"Resolved, 1, that we, the members of the Ministerial Association of St. Petersburg are greatly indebted to him for his clear exposition of Christian Science, and express the hope that he may publish the same in the near future.

"Resolved, 2, that a copy of these resolutions be presented to Mr. Coppage and one each to the local press for publication.

"Signed by President, E. L. Frazier; signed by Secretary, M. H. Norton."

CONTENTS

I.

PAGE

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REASON—IS IT SCIENTIFIC?

Preliminary Observations—The Source of Scientific Knowledge—Basic Postulates of So-called Christian Science—Non-existence of Matter—Futility of Sensation—Unreality of Universally Obvious Phenomena—Popular Objections Considered..... 15

II.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION—IS IT CHRISTIAN?

So-called Christian Science Controverts the Divine Record—Usurps the Divine Prerogative—Repudiates the Divine Economy—Assumes to Revise, Reform, Supplement and Expurgate the Bible—Superior to Christ and the Apostles in Both Healing and Teaching—Repudiates Faith, Repentance, Profession, Water Baptism and Ignores the Lord's Supper—Treats Sin, Sickness and Death as Illusions—Ridicules Material Creation—Claims to Be or Constitute the Holy Ghost or Comforter..... 53

CONTENTS

III.

PAGE

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF ITS OWN PRECEPT AND PRACTICE—IS IT CONSISTENT?

Direct Antagonism Between Its Precept and Practice in Commonplace Matters—Inconsistency of Its Psychological Doctrines—Self-contradictory Teachings as to Its Purely Metaphysical Character—Conflicting Theories as to Cause and Cure of Disease and Disabilities—Repudiates Its Own Claim to Be Based on the Bible—Christian Science Relating to Sex—The Ten Counts in Our Indictment—Conclusion..... 89

I.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REASON—IS IT SCIENTIFIC?

I.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REASON —IS IT SCIENTIFIC?

Preliminary Observations—The Source of Scientific Knowledge—Basic Postulates of So-called Christian Science—Non-existence of Matter—Futility of Sensation—Unreality of Universally Obvious Phenomena—Popular Objections Considered.

LANGUAGE constitutes the usual means of communication between mind and mind, a single word suggesting or representing a single idea. That the sign, therefore, should correspond with the thing signified, or truly present to the reader or hearer the identical idea sought to be conveyed by the speaker or writer, seems obvious. Thus the sense in which the word "Science" is used herein becomes important at the very threshold of this investigation.

Sciens is the present participle of the Latin verb *scire,* to know. It has been transferred into the English with little change, either in its structure or sound. In its substantive form it denotes definite, certain knowledge, clearly ascertained, properly classified, and readily demonstrable, as distinguished from that which is vague, speculative or conjectural. The mathematics of astronomy, for instance, is scientific. Its rules are definite and demonstrable, and its sequences uniform. The exact relative position of

any planet—Mars, for instance—to the earth, or any other of the celestial bodies, may be ascertained with absolute certainty by any competent astronomer with favorable conditions and the requisite appliances; and identical results would be obtained by any number possessing the requisite skill and using due care.

The character and purpose, however, of the lines which have been observed on the face of this planet have not, as yet, been definitely ascertained, although it is said they appear to bear some geometrical relation to each other. No means of demonstrating the truth or falsity of the assumption that they are canals, designed for irrigation or navigation, have been discovered. To so conclude, therefore, would be but conjecture—speculation—hence unscientific.

As science, therefore, includes such knowledge only as is definite, certain, susceptible of orderly classification and ready demonstration, an inquiry as to how such knowledge may be obtained is in order, and the answer is neither difficult nor complex.

All scientific knowledge is originally acquired by perception, otherwise known as primary cognition, by which is meant contact of mind with objective nature by means of one or more of the five corporeal senses. True, knowledge may be communicated by testimony; but it must have been acquired by perception before it could be thus communicated. Scientific knowledge may also be acquired by reason or reflection; but this is rather a knowledge of relations than a knowledge of the objects themselves, which has already been attained by perception through the medium of one or more of the five

senses. Hence it is evident that perception or primary cognition by means of the senses constitutes the basis of, and is therefore an essential element in, all scientific knowledge. Reason or reflection enables us to determine the relation of objects *inter se,* and changes in such relations may aptly be called phenomena; a change in the mutual relations of the sun, moon and earth constituting the phenomenon commonly called an eclipse.

Perception or primary cognition involves three essentials; viz.:

1. A mind capable of perceiving. As every act presupposes an actor, no perception is possible in the absence of a mind capable thereof.

2. A material object susceptible of being perceived. If no object existed, or if existent objects be so distant, so attenuated or so obscured by intervening matter as to be beyond the reach of sensation, no perception thereof would be possible.

3. Means or media by which perception or cognition is consummated.

These means or media uniformly consist of the five corporeal senses: or, if there be other means, our Christian Science friends will confer a favor by informing us as to their kind and character. And for accurate perception, let it be observed, a *sane* mind, a *real* object and *normal* senses are required.

From the foregoing considerations the following propositions appear self-evident; viz.:

1. The Existence of Matter. For if matter be non-existent, so must be every object composed of or pertaining to matter; and hence no perception

thereof is possible. And concerning a non-existent object, no quality, character or condition can be predicated.

2. The Integrity of Sensation. For how can certain, definite and demonstrable knowledge be acquired by or through absolutely futile means? No real knowledge can be derived wholly from a truly futile source.

3. The Reality of Universally Obvious Phenomena. If matter, and hence the objects composed thereof, are really existent, and their character, condition, location, attributes, qualities and movements are accurately projected upon the mind through the senses, the reality of the phenomena which consist of changes in relation as to distance, direction and condition follows as a logical sequence, for a thing can not be real and the elements which compose it be unreal. Hence, to deny the reality of such phenomena is tantamount to denying the existence of the object, the medium through which it is perceived, or both.

Obvious, even axiomatic, as these propositions appear, they are each and all repeatedly, emphatically and categorically denied in the sole text-book of the cult, "Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures," by the founder of the sect, Mary Baker G. Eddy. In fact, the whole superstructure of so-called Christian Science is made to rest on the exact antitheses of the foregoing propositions, multiplied in form and circumstance, but unvaried in emphasis. Its basic postulates, as shown in the cult text-book, are:

1. The Non-existence of Matter.
2. The Futility of Sensation.
3. The Unreality of Phenomena Obvious to All Who Have Attained Normal Mentality.

This we now proceed to show from the cult textbook itself, by quotations, usually verbatim, but occasionally paraphrased for the sake of brevity; in no case, however, perverting or distorting the sense as applied to the matter under consideration.

The book is well arranged for reference, both the pages and lines being numbered, and, in quoting, the first number will indicate the page, a colon separating it from the number of the line at which the quotation begins. A comma between numbers of lines or pages indicates that they are to be taken separately or distributively, while a dash indicates that all intervening matter is included.

I. Non-existence of Matter.

177:10. "Matter, or body, is but a false concept of mortal mind."

261:21. "Matter is only a form of human relief."

270:3. "Everything is matter; everything is mind. Which is it?"

270:5. Matter and mind are opposites; hence both can not be real.

We know not from what school of logic the author of "Science and Health" graduated. Certainly its system was defective, or her acquisition of its principles superficial. Reduced to a syllogism, the argument would appear as follows:

Major premise. Opposites can not coexist.

Minor premise. Mind and matter are opposites.

Conclusion. Therefore mind and matter can not coexist.

Every system of logic worthy of the name requires each premise in a syllogism to consist of a readily demonstrable principle or a conclusively provable fact. Here we have neither. Opposition, by implication, at least, affirms rather than denies antithetic coexistence.

All bilateral objects have opposite sides; masculine implies existence of feminine, east of west, and zenith of nadir.

274: 13. "Christianity and the Science which expounds it (Christian Science) . . . supercede the so-called laws of matter."

A bald and bare assertion without semblance of proof. Gravity, cohesion, extension, mobility, etc., are some of the laws of matter. Do not they operate with the same force and precision as before the founder of Christian Science was born? The laws of germination, reproduction, development in the animal and vegetable kingdoms; the laws of changing seasons and the movements of the celestial bodies, exert the same untiring energy to-day as when the "morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Obedience to the same immutable laws may be predicted with the same certainty as when creation dawned.

273: 1. Matter is "contrary to God, and can not emanate from him."

274: 30. "Matter, examined in the light of divine Metaphysics, disappears."

But how can that which does not, and never

did, exist, be examined or made to disappear?

277:26. "Matter is an error of statement."

A meaningless sentence. A fair sample of the vague and indefinite mode of expression frequently used in the Christian Science text-book. A false assertion concerning matter might constitute a statement of error; but matter itself can not be either an error of statement or the statement of an error.

283:8. "Matter and its effects . . . are not facts of mind. They are not ideas, but illusions."

If matter is but an illusion, then all objects composed of, or pertaining to, matter are also illusions. Thus the sun, moon, planets, and the earth with its trees, mountains and streams; yea, and the ocean with its freighted ships, and the forest, field, factory and mine with their varied products—are all but figments of a fertile imagination. For,

280:7. "Mind creates and multiplies them, and the product can only be mental."

278: 1. "Science reveals nothing in Spirit out of which to create matter."

Before this sentence can give any force to the contention that matter does not exist, it must assume as the major premise in the syllogism that matter can not exist unless Science has revealed its component elements. But Science has not revealed the component elements of either mind or spirit; hence neither mind nor spirit can exist. The major premise is obviously untrue. As explained in the preface, the word "Science," when it occurs in the text-book, means Christian Science as it is taught therein. (See 127:9-12.) So, then, Mrs. Eddy

could not have existed until after her work, "Science and Health," had revealed something out of which she could have been created. Nothing, therefore, could have existed before her revelation was made.

278:3. "Divine metaphysics explains away matter."

By no means true. So-called Christian Science attempts to explain away matter, but matter refuses to be explained away. It persists in projecting itself on, and dominating consciousness. Matter and the various objects composed thereof are as numerous and as persistently obvious as before the birth of the founder of the cult. Moreover, the very means by which her doctrines are preserved and disseminated—viz.: books, paper, ink, type, etc.—are all composed of the very matter which she so vainly endeavors to explain away, and without which not one of her strange doctrines could have been inflicted on a credulous and longsuffering public.

278:29. "We define matter as error."

Matter may be a vehicle of error as well as of truth. It may also constitute a subject of which either truth or error may be predicated. But it can not possibly be defined as error, for a concrete substance can never properly be defined as identical with an abstract term.

278:16. "The admission that there can be material substance requires another; viz.: that matter is self-creative, self-existent, and therefore eternal."

Another obvious example of the single-premise logic, or syllogism in which the major premise is so

evidently untrue that it is omitted. Here is the argument in the form of a syllogism.

1. Nothing exists except the self-creative, self-existent, eternal.

2. Matter is not self-creative, self-existent, eternal.

3. Therefore matter does not exist.

Are our Christian Science friends ignorant of the fact that their major premise in the above syllogism is obviously untrue, and hence no conclusion is deducible therefrom? By endorsing this logic they so pretend.

287 : 27. "Matter is neither a thing nor a person."

289 : 29. "Matter and death are but mortal illusions."

292 : 13. "Matter is the primitive belief of mortal mind."

Clearly wrong. Matter, or an object composed thereof, may constitute *the subject of a belief;* but neither matter nor any object composed thereof (concrete) can be or constitute a belief (abstract), whether primitive or otherwise.

421 : 18. "There is no matter."

Numerous other quotations might be made from the text-book, equally positive and emphatic, to show its teaching on the subject. The foregoing, however, will suffice to prove that the non-existence of matter constitutes one of the basic postulates of so-called Christian Science.

II. The Futility of Sensation.

Recognition of our absolute dependence on the knowledge gained through the five senses for both

safety and efficiency in every phase of human existence and activity, is well-nigh universal among persons of normal mentality. It is only by giving heed to the warnings of sense that we attain any measure of success, or escape the dangers which beset us at almost every turn.

For the control of the numerous mechanical devices designed for both pleasure and utility, with any degree of safety or efficiency, we are dependent almost wholly on the accuracy of the sight, hearing and touch. But for them we would be consumed by the devouring flame, collide with the rapidly moving object, fall into the yawning chasm, or have our vitals torn out by voracious beasts, unconscious meanwhile of the danger.

Seeing, then, that we neither remain passive, nor make a move in any direction or for any purpose, except at the suggestion and under the guidance of one or more of the five senses, it is not strange that their integrity when normally exercised has ever constituted one of the unquestioned axioms of logic. Who, then, will deliberately impeach the only means by which we can obtain information requisite to every sane act and rational conclusion? We know of none outside the so-called Christian Science cult who so dares; and they in theory only—surely not in practice, as will be shown in a subsequent part of this work.

That the absolute and unconditional futility of sensation constitutes another of the basic postulates of the cult doctrines we now proceed to show.

213: 17. "The ear does not really hear."

Then, the eye really sees not and the nerves really feel not. We could see and hear and feel as well without these organs of sense as with them. If the loss of the sense follows the loss of the organ, it is but a coincidence; there is no causative relation.

215:22. "With its divine proof (C) Science reverses the evidence of the senses at every point."

At every point. Not only where the contact is feeble and its relation remote, but also where the contact is definite and energetic and the relation direct. Every contact of the human mind with objective nature by means of the senses is a falsehood, a deception, a reversal of the truth. When the eye presents to the mind the form of an object, it is the opposite, a reversal of what the object really is. When you look into the Christian Science text-book and read the above sentence, it is its antithesis which is there, and it has been reversed to make it appear as you have read it.

To the Christian Scientist, then, every sentence is made to mean just the opposite to what it means to the reader not under its influence. It has been reversed in meaning to that which was conveyed by the sense of hearing or sight.

Then, why send men to teach the Christian Science doctrines by lectures? why print books and periodicals? why assemble on Lord's Day to read and study the Bible or other books—if the eye and the ear are futile, incapable of accurately receiving and transmitting to the human mind the words and the ideas thereby represented? If all of the five senses are

293:31. "Avenues and instruments of error." Which

284:21. "Can afford no proof of God,"

Then in vain do we hear or read the truth from any source. If from the Christian Science text-book or the lecture platform, or even from the Bible, it must be senseless and unreliable; for, how can accurate information come to the human mind through vehicles which are "avenues and instruments of error"?

How did the founder of the cult learn about God? Was it by some means other than the five senses? If so, how? And why does she not tell us how we may obtain information which is accurate? Must we reverse the appearance of every object we see, and of every statement we hear, in order to get the truth?

If coming through the means of the senses reverses, or even nullifies, all information, we have no revelation of truth from God. If all facts are reversed by coming through the senses, we have the exact opposite of the truth, both from the Bible and the Christian Science text-book. Any revelation, therefore, must be nugatory, even though given by God himself, unless by some other means than the senses. How is it to be obtained? How are we who are not under the Christian Science influence to obtain any knowledge thereof?

We do not believe that when man came from the hand of his Maker he was shut out from all communication with kindred minds, and from apprehending and contemplating the beauties of nature,

because of the futility of the only means with which he had been provided. He was given the five corporeal senses—windows of the soul, as it were—by which to perceive, enjoy and utilize the various objects adapted to his pleasure, instruction and development.

It is not probable that a God, described even by our Christian Science friends as too good to create, too wise to permit, and too pure to cognize evil, would endow his most intelligent creatures with faculties which dominate their life by projecting on their consciousness naught but falsehood and deception—vehicles whose prime function was to betray, mislead and deceive.

Where can be found grosser infidelity or more assumptious impeachment of God's wisdom and benevolence?

That we may not even seem to pervert, distort, exaggerate, or to have misapprehended the teaching of our Christian Science friends on this important branch of the subject under consideration, we quote further.

311:26. "The objects cognized by the physical senses have not the reality of substance. They are only what mortal belief calls them."

The Bible, then, is not a substantial reality, because its knowledge came to us through the medium of the senses. Nor is faith, in reality, "the *substance* of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1), because it comes to us *by hearing,* one of the five physical senses (Rom. 10:17).

By "mortal belief" we suppose the author meant

a belief entertained by one who is mortal. As will be shown in a subsequent part of this work, none are mortal—subject to death—except those who recognize its reality; for death is an illusion, powerless over those who so regard it.

Then, "mortal belief" is a belief in the reality of death, by one who thereby becomes subject thereto. and "the objects cognized by the senses" are only what mortal belief calls them. So, if mortal belief calls health disease, or disease health; or if it calls the Bible Christian Science, or Christian Science the Bible, they become so. Or if it calls a plane surface a sphere, or a sphere a cube, it will be so.

312:1. "Whatever is learned through the material sense must be lost because it is reversed by the spiritual fact of (C) Science."

477:11. "Christian Science . . . declares the corporeal senses to be mortal and erring illusions."

So all of the Bible, as well as all of the Christian Science doctrines, learned by means of the five senses must be lost "because reversed by the spiritual facts of Science." Why, then, try to teach people by means of the senses? Since all must be lost, why expend time, money and energy in the fruitless endeavor to accomplish by futile means that which must be reversed?

Writers, speakers, the profound thinkers of every age and clime, appear to have regarded the five physical senses as entirely reliable when normally exercised; and on this assumption have used them as trustworthy vehicles for the transmission of thought, and as the sole media for the cognition of

objective nature, each, of course, within its intended sphere, and concerning the objects to which it is adapted. The apostle Paul states positively that faith, without which it is impossible to please God, comes by hearing (Rom. 10:17). And Christ himself fully recognized the integrity of sight, touch and hearing when he addressed his remarks to Thomas' ears, saying: "Behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (John 20:27).

Though our Christian Science friends utterly repudiate the five senses as media for the acquisition of information, they fail to point out any other means by which the great store of knowledge due to scientific research has been, or may be, acquired. They neither show, nor attempt to show, a single item of scientific information wholly derived from sources other than sensation.

Though bitterly assailing these two witnesses (matter and sensation) as neither competent nor credible, they brazenly use them to the exclusion of other means to place their doctrines before a credulous public, and ask our unqualified assent thereto on their uncorroborated testimony.

A number of instances have been cited in the Christian Science text-book to show how frequently and easily the human mind has been misled by implicit reliance on the evidence of the senses. For instance, the illusions of the sleight-of-hand performer, and the ease with which Rebekah and Jacob misled Isaac in obtaining the blessing intended for Esau.

Even a superficial consideration of these cases, however, will show that they are in no sense due to futility of sensation. In the science of legerdemain it is an open secret that the illusion is due to a concealment of the real facts, objects and conditions from the particular sense which is adapted to their cognition, respectively; thus making the mind draw its conclusion from the testimony of the wrong sense —the one incapable of furnishing the best testimony of the particular matter in question. Of course the senses are not reliable when the very facts, objects and conditions which they are respectively capable of cognizing are withheld from them.

In the case of Isaac, which of the senses misled him? It was not that of sight, for that was gone; and it was the only one especially adapted to individual recognition. Therefore he did not pretend to depend on it. He, therefore, took the best substitute; viz.: the testimony of witnesses on whom he had been accustomed to rely. Was it his hearing? No, for he heard accurately even the falsehood of his wife and son. Nor was it his touch, for it rightly detected the rough and hairy surface of the hands which were submitted thereto. And surely it was not his smell, for that rightly interpreted the odor of the "goodly raiment of her eldest son," with which she had regaled Jacob. His hearing was so reliable that it detected the difference in the voice; but the veracity of the wife of his bosom overruled his intuition.

To say that the sense of hearing is futile because it does not detect a falsehood, or that the sense of

sight is futile because a blind man may be deceived, constitutes a gross perversion of logic. It is no part of the function of hearing to detect falsehood. Its function is to transmit words or other sounds to the mind, whether the ideas thereby represented are true or false. So we see that in this case there is no hint of futility of sensation, nor any circumstance justifying such inference.

Probably it is rarely, if ever, that illusions are due solely to futility of sensation. Attempting to make one sense furnish cognitions for which it is not adapted, failure to assemble a sufficient number of accurate cognitions, and failure to determine their proper relations by reflection, are more frequently the causes of drawing erroneous conclusions. It is for this reason that both childhood and senility are more easily imposed upon than mature manhood. The one has not learned, while the other has forgotten, the danger of concluding important matters without having assembled all the factors, and determined the exact relation which each bears to the equation.

As an illustration, a skillful artist may so shape and color stone, metal, clay, wood or pulp as to be not only similar to, but, in these respects, identical with, an apple or an orange. To the eye alone, it is such; for the eye is not primarily charged with the function of determining the weight, odor, flavor, texture or taste of an object. If we have lost the other senses, or neglect to use them, or give credence to information furnished by others, surely such fact furnishes no ground for asserting the futility of

sensation. We should assemble the cognitions to which each and all of the senses are adapted before concluding the character and quality of the object, especially in a case of vital importance. And we venture to affirm that after being subjected to the usual tests of sight, touch, hearing, smell and taste, not even one of our Christian Science friends would entertain the faintest shade of doubt as to whether the object was an apple or an orange. Try one of them and see if he will not arrive at the same conclusion, by the same means (the senses) and cling to it with the same tenacity as do others.

Thus, while vociferously denouncing the five physical senses as absolutely futile, our Christian Science friends trust and depend on them just as we do; and when normal, and judiciously exercised, they do not fail to furnish even their traducers with the most accurate and reliable information.

From the foregoing considerations it sufficiently appears that the doctrine of futility of sensation is a myth, akin to that of the non-existence of matter. Both are obviously and irreconcilably opposed to primary, axiomatic truth; it is really believed by none, though vehemently professed by our Christian Science friends. That they do not really so believe is proven by both their precept and practice in the ordinary walks of life. Doctrines which are never practiced by those who profess them do not rise to the dignity of convictions.

III. Unreality of Obvious Phenomena.

Corollary to the doctrine of non-existence of matter and futility of sensation, so-called Christian

Science proclaims the unreality of certain phenomena which are obvious to all minds of extensive observation and scientific training. Perhaps nature presents no phenomena more universally common to the experience and observation of the entire human race than sin, or transgression of law; disease, including disability from violence; and death. And these are some of the phenomena the reality of which is denied by so-called Christian Science.

283:8. "Matter and its effects, sin, sickness and death are not facts of mind. . . . They are not ideas, but illusions."

Admitting the non-existence of matter and futility of sensation, we might concede the unreality of sin, sickness and death. For disease, including disability and the pain incident thereto, are but symptoms, indicating abnormal condition of the organs of the material body; sin or crime is but an abuse or perversion of the functions of these organs, and death is a complete cessation of all functional activity. Therefore, if there be no matter, there can be no material body with organs suspectible of becoming abnormal, nor whose functions can cease, be perverted or abused; and the senses being futile, no means would exist for cognizing such conditions, were they possible.

The reality of an object or condition is indicated by its being projected upon normal human consciousness, and permanently dominating the same, regardless of volition. Familiar objects project themselves on our consciousness and persist in dominating the same with immutable assertion of their reality,

whenever and wherever conditions are favorable for contact with them through the medium of the senses. We may obstruct the avenues to the organs of sight, hearing, taste and smell, thereby withdrawing them, at least partially, from contact with objective nature; but the nerves are ever in contact with some material substance; and as soon as the obstruction is removed from the other organs, these objects again thrust their reality upon us with resistless pertinacity, *whether we will or not.* The same sense of reality dominates the consciousness of our Christian Science friends, who, while denying it in theory, proclaim it in practice, just as we do.

In the text-book it is mentioned that an amputated limb will sometimes thrust a sense of its reality on the consciousness of him who lost it (see 212: 5). But this does not meet the question. During delirium, aberration, dreams, and perhaps reverie, unrealities may assume the guise of realities, but only while the abnormal condition continues. On resuming activity the senses dispel the illusion and consciousness promptly responds to their suggestion. Then no amount of sophistry can convince even the Christian Science adherent that the amputated limb has been replaced, as is the lobster's claw. (See 489: 3 *et seq.*)

To argue this question with a trained mind would seem superfluous, for the doctrine rests on the postulates of non-existence of matter and futility of sensation, both of which have been shown to be without foundation in reason.

Notwithstanding the obvious and universal char-

acter of the phenomena known as sin, sickness and death, their reality is absolutely, repeatedly and unqualifiedly denied in the Christian Science text-book, and they are each and all characterized as illusions, superinduced by and solely dependent on a belief that they are real. Without this recognition they would be impotent. This we now proceed to show from the text-book.

184:1. "The so-called laws of health are simply laws of mortal belief."

184:6. "Belief produces the results of belief (reality), and the penalty (reality) lasts as long, and is inseparable from it."

188:3. "What is termed disease does not exist."

159:30. "Belief produces disease and all its symptoms."

385:29. "The opposite belief would produce the opposite result."

188:21. "Sickness is a growth of error, springing from man's ignorance of (C) Science."

As has been shown, the terms "Science" and "Christian Science" are identical and used interchangeably. Then, it is ignorance of Christian Science as taught in the Christian Science text-book from which the error developing in sickness springs. They, therefore, who are not ignorant of its doctrines can not be sick; and they who have studied them with diligence, can not be ignorant thereof, because the text-book contains

456:28. "The whole of Christian Science, or the Science of healing through Mind."

The founder of the cult and sole author of the

text-book became sick, from the effect of which she died. Did this sickness result from ignorance of the doctrines which she declared constituted

147:15. "The complete science of mind healing"? Application of which

462:16. "Is neither difficult nor toilsome." And of which the

459:25. "Process is simple and the results sure." Was the malady which caused her death

286:32. "Without real origin or existence"? And which

415:4. "Had no foundation in fact"?

How could that "growth of error" which constitutes disease dominate a mind thoroughly permeated by truth? How could one be ignorant of the very system which under divine guidance she had founded, devoted a life to perfecting and adapting to every exigency in its power to eliminate sin, sickness and death? Why did not she apply her own infallible and divinely inspired remedy to her own case? It was no less than

471:30. "Divine Science, which, reduced to human apprehension, she named Christian Science." And it was by her claimed to be

274:22. "Absolute, and permits no half-way position in learning the principle and establishing the rule by demonstration."

149:11. "The rule and its perfectness in Science never vary."

The founder yielded to an unreal malady; one without "origin or existence," and which "had no foundation in truth," and for which she had an in-

fallible remedy by simple and easy process. She died of a belief in the *reality* of that whose *unreality* forms the basis of her system—an illusion. Because

159:30. "A man's belief produces disease and all its symptoms."

Had she at any time during her sickness discarded, or recovered from, her belief in the reality of her malady, she must immediately have recovered from the malady itself, for

184:6. "Belief produces the results of belief, and the penalty (reality) lasts *as long* and is *inseparable from it.*"

How could she be subject to the illusions of sickness and death when to her they were not illusions, for she fully understood their illusive character? If the reality consisted solely of a belief in, or recognition thereof, how could they be real to one who repudiated the belief?

472:26. "The only reality of sin, sickness and death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief."

Here is a simple, easy, infallible remedy, divinely prescribed, which utterly fails on the very person who claims to have received the revelation. Can we confide in such?

447:27. "The sick are not healed by declaring there is no sickness, but by knowing there is none."

But how can a disease dependent wholly on a belief in its reality be fatal to, or even affect, one who *knows* it to be unreal?

But Mrs. Eddy did not know disease to be an illusion, an unreality, because she had not definitely

ascertained it to be true. Had she so ascertained, she could have demonstrated the fact, because all that was necessary was to refuse to recognize the fact, for

188:21. "Sickness is a growth of error, springing from man's ignorance of Science."

In her case, as in all others, sickness and death proved to be realities, contrary to the divine revelation of their unreality, given through her. She has neither definitely ascertained nor demonstrated their unreality. In both these essential particulars this basic postulate of so-called Christian Science fails to measure up to scientific standards.

The reality of sickness and death so persisted in and dominated her consciousness as to compel her to recognize, acquiesce in and surrender thereto. This was so absolutely inconsistent with a conviction of their illusive character as to constitute a repudiation or renunciation thereof. Then, during her last sickness and at her death, she renounced, repudiated this basic principle of the Christian Science religion. And so it is—must be—with each and every adherent of the cult. Disease and death are projected upon the consciousness with such persistent and irresistible force that we are compelled to acquiesce in their reality and submit to their dominion. The slightest benefit from the admonition,

227: 20. "Christian Science raises the standard of liberty, and cries, 'Follow me! Escape the bondage of sin, sickness and death'."

does not seem to have been realized, even by her to whom it was divinely revealed.

So we see that all consolation to be derived from belief in the unreality of disease and death, utterly fails us at the very time when it is most needed. In death, as in the sickness preceding, we are compelled to renounce all conviction as to their unreality. Of what value, therefore, can be the religion which proves false and futile, and must be renounced when our hearts are wrung with anguish, our feeble frames racked by fever or distracted by pain, and at death, when all earthly help seems but mockery?

393 : 29. "Man is *never* sick; for Mind *is* not, and matter *can not be*."

417 : 10. "Maintain the facts of Christian Science: that Mind is God, and therefore can not be sick; what is termed matter can not be sick."

All there is, therefore, to sickness is the mental illusion—the belief of its reality. All, therefore, who refuse to recognize—believe in—the reality thereof, must be—can not but be—immune from its influence. Why, then, is it that those who so profess are just as subject to disease as are they who make no such profession? The answer, both ready and sure, is the absolute falsity of the Christian Science doctrine that the physical condition of the human body is controlled by the mental attitude of its possessor.

Belief, then, in disease does not always bring its corresponding penalty, reality; nor are the two inseparable as stated at 184 : 6 *et seq.*

Nor does the opposite belief produce the opposite result, as stated at 385 : 29.

It is claimed by our Christian Science friends that this principle extends to organic disease as well as functional, and to disabilities from accident and violence. We quote:

348:9. "One disease is just as much an illusion as another."

397:14. "When an accident happens, . . . your thought is more potent to make the injury real than the accident itself."

122:24. "To material sense, the severance of the jugular vein takes away life; but to spiritual sense and *in Science* life goes on unchanged."

The author was not *"in Science"*—whatever that may mean—when she repudiated the unreality of sickness and death by yielding an assent to their reality and thereby becoming subject to them, as taught in the text-book. Nor did she have even a "little understanding" of the doctrine divinely revealed to her as to their unreality, for,

329:4. "A little understanding of Christian Science proves the truth of all I say of it."

Hence, "a little understanding" would have proven the unreality of sickness and death by convincing her of their unreality, as taught by her, thereby rendering her immune, for,

184:6. "Belief produces the results of belief; and the penalty (reality) lasts as long, and is inseparable from it."

233:1. "Every day makes its demands upon us for higher proofs, rather than professions. These proofs consist solely in the destruction of sin, sickness and death, as Jesus destroyed them."

329:11. "We must prove our faith by demonstration."

242:30. "The finger-posts of divine (Christian) Science show the way the Master trod, and require the proof which he gave, instead of mere profession."

Has any one of the cult given the proof that Jesus gave? Has any one destroyed sin, sickness and death as he did? If not, the system must be false or no one, not even the author, has sufficient understanding thereof to make a success in a single well-authenticated case.

And yet they flood the country with literature, and send scores of lecturers through the land to instruct people in a Science of which not one of them has even "a little understanding." And notwithstanding its divine and infallible character, it has proven so universal a failure that no well-defined and well-authenticated case can be shown.

And this is what they ask us to accept as scientific. Can we?

So-called Christian Science is not tendered to a suffering and grief-stricken world as a mere sedative or palliative. It is offered as a universal remedy for every ill, physical, moral and spiritual, to which a human may be or become subject. In the text-book it is claimed that

109:11-27. The author sought and obtained by divine revelation the complete system of mind-healing, and

147:15. Gave it complete in that volume. That it contains

456:27. "The whole of Christian Science or the science of healing through mind." And it is stated to be, logically,

129:3. "As harmonious as the reasoning of an accurately stated syllogism, or a properly computed sum in arithmetic."

233:25. As unquestionable as a quotient in division.

149:11. "The rule and its perfectness in Science never vary."

459:25. "The process is simple and the results sure."

462:16. "There is nothing difficult nor toilsome in the task when the way is pointed out.

These quotations are utterly inconsistent with anything less than complete immunity to all ills and maladies of every kind in the one who has a "little understanding of Christian Science" and assents to its doctrines. In fact, it could not be otherwise; for if the disability is identical with the illusion, which it is, how can one be dispelled and the other remain? This would be equal to saying that a thing can be, and not be at the same time.

In a nutshell, so-called Christian Science says there is no matter, hence no material body to become disabled; no material organs to become functionally abnormal, nor reliable sensation to inform us thereof, and so, no disease. There is no material heart to cease sending the blood through the veins, nor material lungs to cease taking air into the system—in fact, no material organs to cease their functional activity—consequently, no

death; for how can a real death be the sequence of an unreal cause?

Nor can death be due to senility or decrepitude, for

244:24. "Man in Science is neither young nor old. He has neither birth nor death."

245:30. "Decrepitude is not according to law, nor a necessity of Nature, but an illusion which may be avoided."

305:27. "Because man is the reflection of his maker, he is not subject to birth, growth, maturity and decay."

Therefore, there can be no death. It can not be caused by disease, for that is an illusion; there is no material body to suffer violence, and senility and decrepitude are conditions to which man is not subject *in Science*. How strange, then, that not one person has been enabled to escape these calamities through this infallible and divinely revealed system.

471:29. "Which, reduced to human apprehension she has named Christian Science."

That I have not misrepresented nor perverted the teachings of the cult about death will appear from further quotations:

42:6. "Death will be found to be a mortal dream, which comes in the darkness and disappears with the light."

44:28. "His disciples believed Jesus dead while in the sepulchre, whereas he was alive."

46:2. "They saw him after his resurrection and learned that he had not died."

But it is urged that, as Christian Science treat-

ment may do some good, we should not fight it. We *fight* nothing in the sense of using physical force or violent language. Nor do we oppose, even courteously, any good which is rationally attributed to such treatment. We simply seek to ascertain to what extent, if any, such treatment is based on correct principles, that by keeping within their limit, we may not neglect other means of relief logically promising, and at the same time avoid dissipating our means and energies in fruitless effort.

Where truth and error are so intermixed in a system as to be inseparable it may be best to reject the whole unless the proportion of error is such as to be practically negligible. Where each is easily recognized and they are readily separable, the error should always be rejected and the truth retained. We welcome any truth which Christian Science doctrines may contain and any good in which its practice may result.

If they are productive of benefit, such fact is due either to accident or to an intelligent application of correct principles to duly ascertained conditions. If, as claimed, the system provides a universal and infallible remedy for every human disease and disability, why not accurately trace its laws of causation in order that the formula for the cure of each malady may be definitely stated, thereby securing certainty—uniformity of sequence?

That mental treatment may relieve—possibly cure—maladies which are purely mental in origin and character, is by no means improbable, but in

order to apply it one needs not to proclaim it as a divine revelation to a nineteenth-century woman, nor that by means thereof may be solved mechanical and chemical problems without the use of mechanical or chemical means or the application of mechanical or chemical laws.

Fractures, ruptures and dislocations in the human body are as purely mechanical as the wearing out, breaking or removal of an essential part from a machine, breaking of a lock or dam, or removal of a part of a building. Destroying life by means of an alkaline poison is as purely chemical in character as is the union of fatty acids and sodium salts in making common soap. If a purely mental process can remove a cinder from the eye, an abscess from the liver or a tumor from the human body, or restore a lost member, why may not it also restore the lock, replace the lost part of the machine or repair a bridge? If the mental process can break down the affinity between the acid and the alkali in the human stomach, why not in the soap-kettle and the chemical laboratory?

It is such irrational propositions as these which we oppose; viz.: That physical results may be attained with certainty without the use of physical means or the application of physical laws; and that God is giving his sanction to such absurd teaching.

That the tenets of every religious sect embody some truth, and that such truth, intelligently applied in cases to which it is adapted, will accomplish good, may be readily conceded. Placing treatment on a false basis, attributing results to a wrong

cause, and claiming infallibility for a system whose failures far outnumber its successes, can not fail to be productive of evil.

"But," says one, "what of the many wonderful cures wrought by Christian Science treatment?" And what of the many wonderful cures that have followed taking dozens of the quack nostrums, accounts of which fill the yellow journals? And what of the wonderful recoveries following treatment by our friends of the Mormon, Mohammedan, Glyggy Bluk, and other sects, and especially those of recent date, by Catholics at Loudres in France?

Shall we assume superiority for the Christian Science cases while the cause assigned is no more rational, the cures reported no more wonderful and the evidence by which they are supported no more convincing?

No case of modern physical healing, due solely to divine or metaphysical means, and bearing all the credentials required by a court of law, has been brought to the notice of this scribe. To make such case even approximately conclusive, the following conditions must concur:

1. The malady must be duly ascertained to be real, not imaginary.

No doubt people often think they have certain diseases, when, in fact, they either have none at all or something entirely different from what they suppose. If the malady be imaginary, it may be relieved by imaginary remedies. If it be from fear, apprehension, anxiety, assurance that they are without foundation should relieve the sufferer. If a

mental picture of disease—an illusion, hypochondria, then dispel the illusion, and the cure is effected.

Here is a fatal weakness in a large proportion of cases where the complication is internal—none but a skilled diagnostician, thoroughly familiar with the relation between symptom and malady, can even guess at the cause, character and extent of disease of this kind. So well recognized is this principle that no respectable court would render judgment for an insignificant sum on the uncorroborated statement of an unskilled witness as to the character or extent of internal complications.

2. The malady must be shown to be such in character and extent as to preclude recovery through human skill, supplemented by the recuperative and restorative energies of Nature; or the cure must be instantaneous.

Nature is ever alert to heal, repair, restore and recuperate. Nor does she confine her efforts in this line to human beings. She exerts them not only on the brute creation, but on inanimate organisms. Probably no man knows just what she can accomplish unaided nor the time required. If there be a well-authenticated case of her performing an instantaneous cure or restoring a lost member to the body, it has escaped my observation, though Christian Science claims that she does both. See 212: 5, etc.

Just how near she may come to these results the writer can not say. But where recovery follows gradually a number of dissimilar treatments, as hygiene, manipulation, medication, surgery, prayer

and metaphysical process, who can say with any degree of certainty that the cure was not wrought by Nature, *in spite of,* rather than *because of,* treatment of any kind. Surely none but the skilled diagnostician can say with certainty *in any case,* and he in *but a few* among the many.

Some of the cures wrought by Nature, wholly unaided, seem almost incredible. The writer hereof could relate a number which have come under his observation, and which, had he been superstitious, he would have doubtless attributed to supernatural means. In some cases Nature did her work so promptly that had it been done by the physician or surgeon the temptation to ascribe unusual skill would have been great.

3. The cure must be complete and obvious.

Relief partial and temporary may be had from some of the most malignant and incurable diseases by the use of stimulants, opiates and anesthetics. The cures wrought by Christ and his apostles were neither partial, temporary nor gradual. The maladies were usually external and structural in character, obvious to all fair-minded observers, and so quickly yielded to the treatment as to preclude their being attributed to intervening agencies. Causation can never be inferred conclusively where relief follows treatment after such lapse of time as would render other means equally probable.

Applying the above criteria and the ordinary rules of evidence recognized by courts for the purpose of avoiding imposition by fraud, mistake and ignorance, not one of the many cases cited under

the somewhat pretentious head of "Fruitage" in the Christian Science text-book, beginning at page 600, makes even a *prima-facie* case of supernatural healing, much less proving it beyond a reasonable doubt.

To convict one of a misdemeanor and subject him to a nominal fine, every rational hypothesis consistent with his innocence must be excluded beyond a reasonable doubt; and that in an open court, under the solemn sanction of an oath, with full opportunity to test the intelligence, credibility, means of knowledge and bias of the witness.

All these precautions, so universally recognized as essential to the trustworthiness of human testimony, have either been neglected or willfully disregarded in the cases given in the text-book. Not a name or street number or post-office address is given; no assurance of the veracity, bias, sanity or means by which they determined the character and malignity of the many diseases about which they testify so glibly.

Were any of these diseases real? If not, the wonderful character of the cure vanishes; for curing an illusion, an imaginary disease by the metaphysical process of convincing the patient of its unreality does not rise to the dignity of an unusual phenomenon. Christian Scientists profess to believe that no disease is real, but that

348-9. "One disease is as much a delusion as another."

Beliving this, how can they testify that the maladies were real? If they do not believe it while

vociferously professing that they do, what confidence can we place in their credibility? Absolutely none.

And what are their means for ascertaining the reality or unreality of these maladies which have been so wonderfully cured? They repudiate the senses as futile. None are left.

The real Christian Scientist, therefore, who testifies to the reality of any disease alleged to have been cured or relieved by Christian Science treatment, stultifies himself by testifying to that which he not only religiously believes untrue, but likewise to that which he religiously believes impossible of ascertainment by means of the five physical senses, the only known means of acquiring knowledge.

What court would solemnly adjudge a thing proven on the uncorroborated testimony of a witness who declared he religiously believed it untrue, and also repudiated the only means by which its truth or falsity could possibly be ascertained? Reader, this is just what you must do in order to give credence to the wonderful—or even unusual—character of the cures related in the Christian Science text-book.

II.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION—IS IT CHRISTIAN?

II.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION—IS IT CHRISTIAN?

So-called Christian Science Controverts the Divine Record —Usurps the Divine Prerogative—Repudiates the Divine Economy—Assumes to Revise, Reform, Supplement and Expurgate the Bible—Superior to Christ and the Apostles in Both Healing and Teaching—Repudiates Faith, Repentance, Profession, Water Baptism and Ignores the Lord's Supper—Treats Sin, Sickness and Death as Illusions—Ridicules Material Creation—Claims to Be or Constitute the Holy Ghost or Comforter.

BY Revelation, we mean, of course, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, commonly called the Bible; for these constitute the basis of modern Christianity.

It is not our purpose to present an argument in favor of the integrity of the sacred Scriptures; they need no defense from us. Our purpose is to ascertain by careful examination, and point out in courteous and kindly language, to what extent, if any, the so-called Christian Science doctrines differ fundamentally from those of the Bible, or stand in irreconcilable conflict therewith.

The Christian Science text-book, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," by Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of the cult, is an extensive volume. It contains seven hundred closely printed pages, about 6.5x4.5 inches, in medium-sized type.

Time and space, therefore, forbid a comparison of *all* its teachings with those of the Bible. But we are confident that we will show that the text-book of which Mrs. Eddy is the author,

1. Controverts the Divine Record,
2. Usurps the Divine Prerogative,
3. Repudiates the Divine Economy.

Having done this, we shall have refuted any claim the cult may assert to Christian character.

In the first chapter of Genesis we read of the creation of the material world and the material objects which were placed thereon; and the question naturally arises, What was the character of the substance thus created? Was it mind, matter or force? Evidently it was not force alone, for force is but a quality, attribute or incident of mind or matter. There can be no mental force without mind, and there can be no physical or material force without matter. Hence, God did not create force independent of mind and matter.

Were the earth and the inanimate objects therein mind or matter?

Were the animals before being invested with life, and man before God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," mind or matter? A common definition of the two words answers the question. They were matter. Nor did the vitalizing of the inanimate beings change, to any extent, the material character of their material parts. Then God created matter.

In every single chapter of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, statements are made con-

cerning the existence, movements, quality, character or condition of material objects; *i. e.*, objects composed of matter. But, how can any statement be true which predicates the being, action, character, quality or condition of an object which has no existence? And how can a material object exist in the absence of matter, its sole component element? Both are obviously impossible.

So-called Christian Science, by denying the existence of matter, also denies the existence of all material objects; and hence, all that is recorded in the Bible as to their character, quality and condition as well as all action by, through or upon them.

We quote a few of the many passages from the text-book denying the existence of matter.

177:10. "Matter, or body, is but a false concept."

261:21. "Matter, which is only a form of human belief."

273:1. "Matter is contrary to God, and can not emanate from him."

277:26. "Matter is an error of statement."

283:8. "Matter and its effects . . . are not facts. They are not ideas but illusions."

421:18. "There is no matter."

But some one will doubtless ask if this language is not used figuratively. Surely it is not meant to deny material creation as set forth in the Bible.

That there be no mistake on this question, we quote further.

109:32. "The three great verities of Spirit—

omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence, . . . contradict forever the belief that matter can be actual."

335:7. "God never created matter."

522:20. "God's glowing denunciations of man, . . . convince reason and co-incide with revelation in declaring material creation false."

From the foregoing it is obvious that Christian Science opposition to the Bible record as to the existence of matter is diametric and irreconcilable.

To reach the conclusion that the Christian Science doctrine of futility of sensation is equally opposed to that of the Bible requires but a superficial comparison of the texts of the two books.

In Gen. 2:16 we read: "And the Lord commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

In the Book of Exodus the expression, "And God said unto Moses," occurs with remarkable frequency.

But if it be true, as taught by the Christian Science text-book, that the sense of hearing, along with the other material senses, is one of the

293:31. "Avenues and instruments of error."

477:12. "Mortal and erring illusions." And which

215:22. "Christian Science reverses at every point." And

312:1. Whatever is learned thru them is lost

because reversed by the spiritual fact of (C) Science." One of the senses which

284:21. "Can afford no proof of God." And if

213:17. "The ear does not really hear."

If—we say the ear, the eye, the sense of touch, taste and smell are all so absolutely futile and unreliable as media of conveying thought, what was accomplished by all that God said to Adam, to Moses, or to any other person? These and other passages from the Christian Science textbook which might be multiplied almost indefinitely, charge God with the folly of giving commands and uttering threats through means unintelligible and utterly inadequate to the transmission of thought.

In Heb. 11:6 it is said that "without faith it is impossible to please God"; and in Rom. 10:17 that faith—doubtless the kind which is pleasing to God—comes by hearing.

In the second and third chapters of Revelation the apostle John represents the risen Lord as saying, "He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches." He also told John to write by the messengers (angels) of the several churches.

In John 20:27, he said to Thomas, "Behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." Did not the Lord, in these very acts, address Thomas by means of the ear, and, at the same time, assert by implication the integrity of both the sight and touch by appealing to Thomas to use them for the purpose of correcting a misapprehen-

sion? Why should the Master address Thomas through the ear if that organ was futile as a vehicle of thought? Why say, "Behold my hands," if the eye is but an avenue and instrument of error? And why say thrust thy hand "into my side," if the touch is so unreliable that its testimony "must be lost because reversed by the spiritual fact of science"? And how could the several messages to the churches concerning God and the things pertaining to his kingdom be of any avail if the eye be one of the senses which "can afford no proof of God"?

The idea that God made a revelation to man, yet furnished no reliable means by which it might be *truly* and *accurately* apprehended, is too preposterous for the consideration of sentient beings. Especially is this true where such revelation purports to involve man's highest interest for both time and eternity.

As regards the futility of sensation, Christian Science, therefore, stands in direct and irreconcilable conflict with the Bible.

So, also, will be found its teaching as to the unreality of sin, sickness and death; for any, even apparent, plausibility with which this proposition may be invested involves the assumption that matter is non-existent and sensation futile. A few passages are here quoted:

283:8. "Sin, sickness and death are not facts. They are not ideas, but illusions."

207:25. "They are errors which presuppose the absence of Truth."

90:24. Christian Science teachings "shut the door on death."

428:1. "There is no death."

480:19. "God, or good, could never make man capable of sin."

Throughout the entire Bible sin, sickness and death are treated as solemn and momentous realities. From one end to the other sin is held forth as the one great curse of the human race. The insidious manner of its introduction, its distressing effect on humanity, and the misery entailed on its numerous victims, are all set forth in the most vivid and solemn language. Sickness and death are also set forth as serious and potent agencies of suffering and distress. Christian Science regards them as illusions.

Genesis informs us that God warned Adam and Eve against the commission of one unreality—sin, that they might escape punishment by the infliction of another—death. "Thou shalt surely die" meant that they would be subjected to, or seized by, a delusion—a counterfeit, of which there was, and is, no counterpart or reality in Nature from which its true character could be learned.

The devil suggested that there was some mistake about the penalty. "Ye shall *not* surely die" (Gen. 3:4). According to Christian Science teaching, Satan was right, for if death is unreal, they *could* not surely, or really, die.

Satan, then, told the truth, and God either mistook or misrepresented the facts when he threatened our first parents with an unreal penalty.

God also pronounced a severe penalty on Satan for telling the truth; and also on our first parents for believing it. In doing this he made two more mistakes, in that he predicted suffering, which according to Christian Science is unreal, and the pain of child-bearing; for there is no such thing.

244:24. "Man in (C) Science . . . has neither birth nor death."

258:27. "Never born, never dying."

305:27. "He is not subject to birth, maturity and decay."

According to Christian Science, the world which God created was immaterial, for matter was non-existent; the man placed thereon was mythical, for he had neither material organs nor reliable senses; he was tempted by an impersonal devil to partake of fruit which he could neither see, feel, taste nor smell, for these senses were all futile; but he thereby committed a sin of which he was incapable (see 480:19) and incurred an impossible penalty—death.

In the fourth chapter of Genesis we again find sin spoken of as a serious reality in the murder of Abel, Cain's falsehood, and the illusive penalty pronounced; for if sin, suffering and death are illusions, no real murder could be committed nor real penalty inflicted.

The most diligent search of the Bible, however, fails to disclose any hint as to the illusive character of sin, sickness and death, while almost every page is pregnant with obvious implications of their grave realism. Therefore, in this respect also is the divine record positively and unequivocally con-

troverted by Christian Science. Possibly there is no better way of emphasizing the incongruity than by setting out *in hæc verba* prominent passages from each.

The Bible says, "Hezekiah was sick unto death" (2 Kings 20:1); "They brought to him a man sick of the palsy" (Matt. 9:2); Dorcas "was sick and died" (Acts 9:36, 37); "Lazarus was sick" (John 11:2).

Christian Science says there is no sickness. It is an illusion, a growth of error springing from ignorance of Science (188:21).

The Bible says, "All flesh died that moved on the face of the earth" (Gen. 7:21); "Lazarus is dead" (John 11:14); "The beggar died: . . . the rich man also died" (Luke 16:22; Rom. 5:6); "Christ died for the ungodly;" "It is appointed unto men, once to die" (Heb. 9:27).

Christian Science says:

44:28. "The disciples believed Jesus dead while in the tomb; whereas he was alive."

46:2. "They saw him after his crucifixion and learned that he had not died."

209:1. "Man, being immortal, has (present tense, not will have) a perfect indestructible life."

289:18. "What appears to be death is but a mortal illusion."

258:27. "Never born, never dying."

305:28. "He is not subject to birth, growth, maturity and decay."

Yet our Christian Science friends fail to show us a single person who came into existence other-

wise than by the natural process of procreation and parturition; or who left it otherwise than by violence, decay or dissolution.

To show that these contradictions are not inadvertent nor the antithesis incidental, but that they are both intentional and deliberate, we quote further:

521:26. "The second chapter of Genesis contains a statement . . . which is the exact opposite of scientific truth."

522:3. "The (C) Science of the first record (chapter) proves the incorrectness of the second, for they are antagonistic."

522:24. "The latter part of the second chapter of Genesis is based on some hypothesis of error."

So it is the *Christian* Science of the first chapter —that is, the interpretation which so-called Christian Science has placed thereon—which *proves the incorrectness of the second.* Remember that *Science,* in the text-book, means *Christian Science* (127:9; 471:29).

Christian Science creates the antagonism by a groundless interpretation, which it insists must prevail over that recognized by the prophets, Christ, the apostles and the religious world; for they each and all recognize the reality of material creation, the very thing which Christian Science denies.

Not only, however, does Christian Science openly deny such parts of the Bible as seem to militate against its irrational tenets; it contains numerous insidious attempts at hypercriticism which may escape the scrutiny of the casual reader. The author's audacity in resting her interpretations on

her own bare and bald assertion, rather than on some rational hypothesis, tends to divert the inert or uncritical mind from their irreverent tendencies. The book contains a number of tacit suggestions that the Bible is crude, incomplete and inaccurate; and to us these appear as if intended to prepare the mind for considering the author's claim to superiority over Christ as a healer, and as an inspired writer over the men who wrote as the Spirit gave them utterance.

If this be true, it is no less than a usurpation of the prerogative of Deity; and we now proceed to adduce the evidence.

By reference to page 147, line 15 and page 456, line 21, it will be seen that the Christian Science text-book assumes to contain a complete and infallible system of healing through mind; and that

149:11. "The rule and its perfectness in Christian Science never vary."

147:24. "Our Master healed the sick and taught the *generalities* of its divine principle to his disciples; but he left no definite rule for demonstrating this principle of healing and preventing disease. *This remained to be discovered by Christian Science.*"

Now, honest reader, is not this a claim to superiority over Christ himself in the system which she discovered and gave to the world in its completeness, while Christ gave it only partially, *because not then known, even by him?*

472:6. "God has set his signet on Christian

Science, making it co-ordinate with all that is real and eternal."

But what is *real* and *eternal?* Let the text-book answer.

151:26. "All that *really* exists is the Divine Mind."

If her work is co-ordinate with all that is real and eternal, and Divine Mind, or God, is all that is real and eternal, then her work is co-ordinate —of equal rank—with God. And if she is superior to her work, as "He who builded the house hath more honor than the house," it follows that she is superior to God. (See Heb. 3:3.)

It is claimed in the text-book for so-called Christian Science, that

457:1. "It first registered revealed Truth, uncontaminated by human hypotheses."

548:2. "Separates Truth from error (in the Scriptures) and breathes thru the sacred pages the spiritual sense of life."

Here we have two obvious implications against the integrity of the Bible; viz.:

1. That it contains error; else how could Christian Science separate its error from its truth?

2. That it is contaminated by human hypotheses; that is, only partially divine in its origin and authority.

If the Bible registered revealed truth *uncontaminated by human hypotheses,* Christian Science was not the first, for it post-dated the Bible by nearly two thousand years. If the Christian Science text-book was the first *un*contaminated, the Bible

was so contaminated. None of the Old or New Testament writings, then, is free from human hypotheses, for Christian Science was the first.

It is, then, the only religious work solely divine in its origin and authority. All others are contaminated by human hypotheses. And on it

472:6. "God has set his signet, making it coordinate with all that is real and eternal."

Christian Science also "separates truth from error, and breathes through the sacred pages the spiritual sense of life."

Who commissioned its author to arraign inspired men at the bar of her inerrant wisdom and to determine which was truth and which error on the "sacred pages"? If the Bible is God's word, one of three things is true. God's word is infallible or he has mistaken or misrepresented the facts recorded. If God mistook the facts, one wiser than he must correct him; if he misrepresented them, one more truthful must reprove him. And he who assumes to do so, *assumes superior wisdom and integrity.*

From this conclusion there is no escape.

534:1. "She (woman) was the first to discern spiritual creation."

534:6. "The first to interpret the Scriptures in their true sense."

The particular woman who first did these things is not named, but we run no risk in assuming that it is the same woman who "first registered revealed truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses," the foundation for whose assumption of

divine prerogative was then being cautiously laid.

None of the ancient worthies; none of the prophets or apostles; not even Christ himself, had "registered revealed truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses," discerned "spiritual creation," nor "interpreted the Scriptures in their true sense."

John, the beloved of the Master, lived to a ripe old age, saw the last chapter added to the canon of inspiration, contributed thereto five of its volumes, including the last and most mysterious; and, in the twilight of his declining years, doubtless looked daily for the coming of his Lord to rend

> The mystic veil which hangs between
> The visible and the unseen.

Already worn so thin by time that he with apocalyptic vision gained glimpses into the great beyond; yet he, the last and most deep-seeing of all the apostles, had not "discerned spiritual creation," learned to interpret the Scriptures "in their true sense," nor "registered revealed truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses."

Do not the above quotations show a claim by the author of the Christian Science text-book to superiority over Christ in her system of healing; to the apostles in revealing and interpreting God's will, and equality with God himself in authority to revise and correct the Bible?

Never was logical syllogism more pregnant with inerrant conclusion.

Is further corroboration desired? If so, we quote:

99:10. "Truth has furnished the key, and with

this key Christian Science has opened the door of human understanding. None may pick the lock *or enter by some other door.*"

110:17. "No human tongue or pen taught me this Science; neither tongue nor pen can destroy it. It may be distorted by shallow criticism, but the Science and Truth therein will remain forever."

150:6. "Its appearing is the coming anew of the gospel. This coming was promised by the Master for its establishment as a permanent dispensation to remain forever. Now, as then, signs are wrought; but these signs are only to demonstrate its *divine origin.*"

472:6. "God has set his signet on Christian Science, making it co-ordinate with all that is real and eternal."

At 331:30 the Trinity is said to consist of "God the Father; Christ the spiritual idea of sonship; divine Science, or the Holy Comforter."

Remember that divine Science and Christian Science as taught in the text-book are identical (127:9; 471:29 and 456:27).

So, then, the Christian Science text-book is the Holy Comforter promised by John; in other words, the Holy Spirit. It constitutes the key to the Kingdom or door through which all *must* enter, and the lock which none can pick. It is, therefore, the only means of salvation.

But some one may suggest that our deductions are more extreme than the premises will justify. Let us see.

369:32. "No man is physically healed in sin."

210:17. "Jesus healed the sick and destroyed sin by the same metaphysical process."

404:27. "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science."

406:3. "Sin and sickness are both healed by the same principle."

If healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same, then, when a physical malady is healed, the sick man is also reformed—redeemed from sin. He is no longer a sinner, but a Christian—a child of God. And if the Christian Science text-book contains the complete system of healing (147:15 and 456:27), but Christ left no definite rule therefor (147:24), it follows that the Christian Science system of physical healing, which carries also reformation or redemption from sin, is superior to that prescribed by Christ. Placed in the form of a syllogism:

1. Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same in principle and process.

2. The Christian Science system of healing the sick is superior in perfectness and efficiency to that given by Christ.

3. Therefore the Christian Science system of reforming the sinner is superior in perfectness and efficiency to that given by Christ.

Thus Christian Science has usurped the divine prerogative of reforming or saving the sinner from sin by *substituting a superior system.*

But this is not all. Another element of superiority claimed for the Christian Science system

consists of immunity from relapse into the sinful condition. No such immunity was claimed for the gospel system prior to the advent of so-called Christian Science.

217: 16. "When you have once conquered a diseased condition of the body thru Mind, that condition *never recurs.*"

We have already shown that in Christian Science physical healing and spiritual reformation are one and the same—rest on the same principle and are controlled by the same process, and that the penalty lasts as long and is inseparable from the cause.

If *present* freedom from disease is contingent or dependent on *present* freedom from sin, will not *future* freedom from disease be contingent or dependent on *future* freedom from sin? If not, why not?

If healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same—rest on the same principle—controlled by the same process, and if "no man can be physically healed in sin," then present freedom from disease is contingent on present freedom from sin. One can not, therefore, relapse into the one without relapsing into the other. As, therefore, the diseased condition, after Christian Science treatment, "never recurs," how can the sinful condition recur?

Christian Science claims to constitute a universal and infallible system for the cure of all ills, including disability and dismemberment, bringing therewith immunity from recurrence. It claims also, on the same principle, by the same process,

and as co-incident therewith, to give freedom from sin. On what principle, therefore, does the immunity from disease not extend also to sin? Is not this assuming to offer a more complete and permanent salvation from the dominion of sin than that offered in the New Testament? Assuming a prerogative which belongs exclusively to God? If not, why not?

The following letter appeared in the *Christian Science Sentinel,* one of the official organs of the cult, for the month of January, 1910:

"BROOKLINE, Mass., Dec. 24, 1909.

"DEAR MR. MCCLELLAN:—

"Christian Science practitioners should make their charges equal to those of reputable physicians in their respective localities.

"MARY BAKER EDDY."

Holding in mind the above letter, we quote from the text-book:

482:27. "Christian Science is the law of truth which heals on the basis of one mind, or God. It can heal in no other way."

483:5. "We classify disease as error, which nothing but truth or Mind can heal; and this Mind must be divine, not human."

231:8. "If God heals not the sick, the sick are not healed; for no lesser power equals divine, All-power."

So, then, it is God, divine, infinite, All-power, which does the healing

228:25. For "there is no power apart from God, and to acknowledge any other is to dishonor him."

459: 12. "Any attempt to heal with erring mortal mind, instead of resting on the omnipotence of the divine Mind, must prove abortive. It is like putting a sharp knife into the hands of a blind man or raging maniac, and turning him loose in crowded streets."

Still practitioners are directed to "make charges equal to those of reputable physicians," for that which they know is beyond human skill, and which they know they can not accomplish.

Do the Christian Science practitioners tell their patients all these facts? Do they inform them why their presence is necessary to induce God to act?

God's *power* being both ample and exclusive, why is he *willing,* only—or even *more willing*—in the presence of a Christian Science practitioner?

God's power being freely admitted, if he refuses to heal, it must be for some reason which he deems sufficient. If we can ascertain the conditions on which God predicates his refusal, and correct them; or if we can convince him that his reasons are insufficient, the difficulty may be obviated. Does Christian Science show how either of these objects may be accomplished, or God's willingness to heal be induced by other means? Then, how does the Christian Science practitioner contribute to the healing of the sick? If the text-book does not contain this essential information, it is not the complete guide in healing which it professes to be, and should be repudiated.

If God alone heals the sick, the act in each case is either conditional or unconditional. If the

latter, no system, practitioner, medicine, process or co-operation of any kind can be of any avail. If conditional, the only method worthy to be called scientific would consist of ascertaining the exact conditions and giving specific directions for compliance therewith. Does the Christian Science textbook even pretend to do this? Read it, my friend, and see. You will fail to find that it does.

Is it the intercession of our Christian Science friends which is so potent in inducing God to perform that bodily healing which is

404:27. "One and the same with reforming the sinner"? And for which they charge equal to reputable physicians? And is not this making merchandise of the gospel—offering in competition with the old kind a little better quality of religion at a little different price?

One who appears to have attained some skill in taxing the credulity of devout people from purely commercial motives was severely rebuked by the apostle Peter, in these words: "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money" (Acts 8:20).

May a similar fate await all those who are engaged in victimizing the ignorant and credulous by their commercial devotions; even though the gains thereby extorted be expended in costly edifices, ostentatious equipage, or devoted to the benevolence of the gospel of "the loaves and fishes."

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ, or, Here: believe *it* not. For there

shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch as if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24:23, 24).

False teachers and false reformers have ever given their pernicious doctrines a sufficient admixture of truth to render them at least apparently plausible. But the writer of these pages does not remember ever before to have seen so great profession predicated on so meager performance; nor so arrogant and obvious assumption of divine wisdom and prerogative associated with so little consistency, logical acumen and reverence for the integrity of the Scriptures.

Approved lexicons of modern times define such and similar assumptions as blasphemy; and even the scribes and Pharisees of Christ's time understood such to be the character of any attempt to forgive sin (Luke 5:21).

Christian Science also repudiates the divine economy or gospel plan of salvation.

The New Testament or gospel economy describes salvation from sin as being predicated on obedience to divine commands.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21).

"Blessed are they who do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city" (Rev. 22:14).

These and many other Scriptures prove that obedience is superior to mere profession. Among the things enjoined by the New Testament economy are faith or belief, repentance, profession, baptism and the eucharist. We are not discussing the essential character of any one or more, nor of the relative importance of any one as compared with the others. We simply assert that they are means of grace prescribed by the Scriptures, and undertake to show that they are all practically repudiated or ignored by so-called Christian Science.

The apostle informs us that "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. 11:6). And that faith—doubtless the kind which is pleasing to God—"comes by hearing" (Rom. 10:17). Books were rare, and the ability to read them possessed by few; hence oral instruction was almost universal. But Christian Science repudiates both the sense of hearing and that of sight. It characterizes them as

293:31. "Avenues and instruments of error."

477:12. "Mortal and erring illusions."

284:21. "Can afford no proof of God."

312:1. Whatever "is learned through them is lost, because reversed by the spiritual fact of (C) Science."

How can we be permeated by a divine faith while repudiating the divinely prescribed means for its acquirement?

Does so-called Christian Science repudiate repentance? It certainly does in practice, if not in theory. We quote:

480:23. "Evil is but an illusion; an error which has no real basis."

480:19. "God, or good, could never make man capable of sin."

525:28. "Sin . . . as devoid of reality as it is of truth."

Now, Bible repentance does not mean sorrow simply, but reformation, a turning from evil. In Matt. 12:41 Jesus said, "The men of Nineveh repented." Jonah 3:10 tells how they repented; viz.: "turned from their evil way." Heb. 12:17 informs us that although Esau's sorrow was diligent even to tearfulness, "he found no place for [means of] repentance."

But how can a *real* reformation be consummated against an *unreal* evil? an illusion? How can one repent, turn from an evil which he was and is incapable of committing? How can he even be sorry for having done that which is impossible and of which he is incapable?

That our Christian Science friends repudiate or ignore water baptism is evident from the definition of the word "baptism" in the text-book.

581:23. "Baptism. Purification by Spirit. Submergence in Spirit."

Were the apostles submerged in spirit at the beginning of the gospel dispensation, when they were overwhelmed by the visible and tangible presence of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost? (Acts 2:2.)

Had the new converts at the house of Cornelius undergone "submergence of the Spirit." on whom

Peter said "the Holy Ghost fell, *as on us at the beginning"?* And of whom he said, "God gave like gift as unto us"? (Acts 11:15-17.) Peter evidently thought it was a baptism of the Holy Ghost, for he says in verse 16 that it brought to mind the prediction which Jesus had made of that very thing. But he nowhere intimated that it was identical with, or constituted a substitute for, water baptism. On the contrary, he makes it a reason why water baptism should be accorded them. "Who shall forbid water that these should not be baptized who *have received* the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And he commanded (not advised) them to be baptized.

But what is the *"Spirit,"* in which the so-called Scientist requires "submergence"? It is no more nor less than the Christian Science doctrines set out in the text-book; and the "submergence" consists of being completely overwhelmed or permeated thereby, as we now proceed to show.

In the Glossary of the text-book, at page 588, the primary definition of Holy Ghost is *Divine Science.* We have shown in a number of places that Divine Science and Christian Science are identical and used interchangeably therein. But we quote further. Defining the Trinity:

331:30. "God, the Father; Christ, the divine *idea* of sonship; (not the son) divine Science, the Holy Comforter."

471:30. *"Divine Science,* which reduced to human apprehension, she has named *Christian Science."*

127:9. "The terms, divine Science, Spiritual Science, Christ Science, or Christian Science, or Science alone, she uses interchangeably according to the requirements of the context. *These synonymous terms,*" etc.

456:28. The Christian Science text-book "contains the whole of Christian Science."

Now, honest reader, if Spirit means the Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost or Comforter, and if the Holy Ghost or Comforter is divine Science, otherwise called Christian Science; and if the text-book contains all of Christian Science, how can one accomplish a more complete and thorough "submergence in Spirit" than by becoming completely permeated with and enveloped by the doctrines which the text-book contains? Will some of our Christian Science friends answer?

Does Christian Science also repudiate profession? We shall see; but let us first determine the kind of profession which was made by the converts in the days of the apostles.

"And the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart [without mental reservation], thou mayest. And he answered, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts 8:36, 37).

What did the eunuch profess? Evidently, belief in the divine sonship of Christ. Nothing more, nothing less. Does Christian Science repudiate this? Beyond all question, as we will now proceed to show.

We go again to the glossary of the text-book, and on page 589 find the word "Jesus" defined as follows: "The highest human corporeal concept of the divine idea." Anything about being the Son of God?

583:10. "Christ. The divine manifestation of God, which comes to the flesh to destroy incarnate error." Son of God? No, a miracle is a divine manifestation, and so is a message.

On the Christian Science platform, set forth in the text-book, beginning at page 360, line 10, we have thirty-two articles setting out the principles which form the bases for the cult doctrines in detail.

Surely here is the place where, in addition to the glossary, the divine character of the Christ should be clearly set forth. We quote:

331:26. "VII. Life, Truth, and Love constitute the triune Person called God,—that is, the triply divine principle, Love. They represent a trinity in unity, three in one,— . . . God, the Father; Christ the spiritual *idea of sonship;* divine (Christian, 127:9) Science the Holy Comforter."

Not Christ, *the son;* not even Christ the *idea* of *the son;* but the idea of *sonship.* The *idea* of a son falls far short of being a son, and "the idea of sonship" falls far short of constituting either.

But it is suggested that this is ignoring, rather than repudiating, the claim of Christ to be the Son of God. But does this help the matter? Will a work "divine in origin," and on which

472:6. "God has set his signet, . . . making

it co-ordinate with all that is real and eternal"—

Will a work of this kind, both in its basic articles and in its definitions, ignore the chief element in the character of him who is the "author of eternal salvation"?

But it is neither willful ignorance nor inadvertence. We will show that Christian Science repudiates the divinely appointed evidence of Christ's divine sonship. Paul says, "declared to be the Son of God."

But how? "With power [Gr. *en dynamei*], by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1:4). In other words, the powerful and convincing evidence of his divine sonship was the resurrection *from the dead.*

But Christian Science says that Jesus never died. His disciples saw him after his crucifixion and learned that he had not died.

The resurrection of a sound and perfect body which had never tasted death would furnish but poor evidence of divine sonship. What but divine power could resurrect the really dead? Christian Scientists, therefore, assume the inconsistent attiture of either willfully and deliberately ignoring Christ's claim to be the Son of God, or of affirming the fact itself, yet repudiating the divinely appointed and irrefutably conclusive evidence thereof.

So we see that if profession of a belief in the divinity of Christ as the Son of God forms any part of the Christian Science economy, it must be of such shallow and superficial character as amounts to a renunciation.

We are informed that the Lord's Supper, or eucharist, is not celebrated in any of the Christian Science meetings; and in our somewhat careful examination of the text-book we have found neither doctrine nor definition which appears to be in conflict with this information.

So we have shown that all these provisions of the gospel economy for reformation and development of Christian character; viz.: faith, repentance, profession, baptism and the eucharist, are practically repudiated.

But this is not all. Paul says that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16). In his letter to the church at Corinth, after reminding it of his faithful preaching of the gospel, he proceeds to enumerate its basic principles thus:

"For I delivered unto you first of all that which I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3, 4). Now, is not an actual death the fundamental fact or corner-stone of the entire gospel superstructure? Confinement of a living body in a stone sepulchre, neither filled nor hermetically sealed, and emergence therefrom after some fifty hours, would hardly cause a ripple of surprise, much less be heralded as a world-wonder. The actual death of Christ, and his resurrection *"from the dead,"* not from a pretended or simulated death, constitutes the burden of the apostle's argument in this remarkable chapter. Read down to the twentieth verse.

Christian Science teaches

283:8. "Sin, sickness and death . . . are illusions."

428:1. "There is no death."

44:28. "Jesus . . . while in the tomb . . . was alive."

46:2. "They (his disciples) saw him after his crucifixion, and learned that he had not died."

Thus it is seen that Christian Science repudiates the fundamental facts of the gospel, ignores the means provided in the divine economy for its establishment and rejects the ordinances prescribed for its continuation.

Anticipating the charge of iconoclasm against this work, we promised in the preface to show that our Christian Science friends surpassed all other religious cults in iconoclasm or destructive didactics. In fulfillment of that promise we have shown that with one sweep of the magic wand of interpretation they seek to destroy the one essential foundation fact of the whole Christian world—the death of Christ, thereby challenging his divinity; for Paul says: "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection *from the dead.*"

The charge of iconoclasm comes with bad grace from the lips of our Christian Science friends, their doctrines being far more iconoclastic and destructive of modern Christianity than all other religious cults. They are not only destructive of the primary elements of Christianity, but also of the basis on which every logical syllogism must rest.

Logic is but the orderly and accurate process for ascertaining truth.

But no truth can be predicated, much less proven, concerning matter or objects composed thereof which are non-existent, and of which the five senses—man's only means of taking cognizance thereof—are futile.

Try it, reader, and when you have discovered means of cognizing non-existent objects through futile senses you will have a postulate for Christian Science logic. When you have found some fact susceptible of proof independent of matter and sensation, please inform the writer of the fact and the method of proving it.

"For I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.

"And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book" (Rev. 22: 18, 19).

An actual pre-script, inter-script or post-script is no more essential in making an addition to an instrument than is a physical expurgation in detracting therefrom. Sinister interpretation may be equally effective, or even more dangerous, because difficult to detect.

So-called Christian Science has done all three. It had added to the Bible a large volume—some eighteen thousand words—not as human exegesis, but as *divine in its origin and infallibly authoritative.* It

457:1. "First registered revealed truth, uncontaminated by human hypotheses."

150:6. "Its appearing is *the coming anew of the gospel* . . . promised by the Master."

150:13. "Now, as then (in the time of Christ) signs and wonders are wrought; but these are only to demonstrate *its divine origin.*"

95:22. "Christian Science—*the divine reality.*"

By interpretation so-called Christian Science has clothed certain passages of Scripture with shades of meaning never before suspected; and has stricken down others well settled by the recognized rules of construction.

In its glossary it has clothed names, words and phrases with ridiculous and contradictory definitions, without assigning either reason or authority. (See Glossary, pp. 579 to 599.)

It has eliminated *Matter,* and hence, every material object mentioned in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

It has repudiated the five corporeal senses, and thus deprived man of all reliable means of cognizing objective Nature or spiritual truth.

It denies both the death and omnipotence of Jesus Christ, thereby making void the divinely appointed proof of his divinity.

It rejects the infallibility and completeness of the Bible, claiming the right to post-scribe, expurgate, and otherwise revise its teaching, setting aside all parts which seem to conflict with its doctrines, as

521:26. "The exact opposite of scientific truth."

522:24. "Based on some hypothesis of error."

And, finally, Christian Science characterizes all —even that contained in the Bible—which does not conform to, or is not reiterated in the denominational text-book, as untrue.

202:13. "Christian Science lights the torch of spiritual understanding. Outside *this Science,* all is unstable error."

545:18. "Outside of Christian Science all is vague and hypothetical, the opposite of truth." The Christian Science text-book

456:27. "Contains all of Christian Science."

As all of Christian Science is in the text-book, all outside the book is outside Christian Science. All, then, of the Bible which is outside of or not contained in the Christian Science text-book is "unstable error," "the opposite of truth," which is falsehood. Then, all the Bible which is not reiterated, reaffirmed in the Christian Science text-book is false.

So we see that the parting injunctions of the sacred volume concerning additions and subtractions, have been deliberately violated in every particular. The Bible has been explained away, interpreted away, super-scribed, inter-scribed, post-scribed and expurgated.

Finally, all has been eliminated save that small part which the author of "Science and Health" saw fit to retain in the work which was to constitute the text-book of this modern cult. How shall they who do such things attain the blessings or escape the curses therein promised?

Honest reader, candid and sincere seeker after truth, have not we fully redeemed our promise to show that so-called Christian Science controverts the divine record, usurps the divine prerogative and repudiates the divine economy? To recapitulate:

It controverts the divine record in the following particulars:

1. By characterizing certain parts thereof as false—the exact opposite of truth. 521:26; 522:3; 522:20; 522:24.

2. By sundry statements in direct conflict therewith. 44:28; 46:2.

3. By assailing certain parts with irreverent and sarcastic ridicule. 531:32; 533:15.

4. Denying the existence of Matter, and thereby denying by obvious implication every statement in the Bible concerning the existence, character and condition of every material object therein named.

5. Denying the integrity of the five senses, by, through and to which alone God appeals to man in Revelation.

6. Characterizing as illusions, myths, etc., sin, sickness and death, all of which the Bible everywhere treats as solemn, momentous realities.

7. And finally sweeping away the chief cornerstone—yea, the whole foundation of modern Christianity—*the death of Christ.*

It also usurps the divine prerogative in the following particulars:

1. Assumption of healing power superior to that of Christ." 147:15-28.

2. Assumption of authority to revise, reform,

substitute, supplement and expurgate the Bible in word, letter and divine interpretation.

3. Assumption of the character and authorship of the Holy Comforter. 331:31.

4. Assuming to offer a more complete and permanent remedy for sin than that contained in the Bible, and on more favorable terms.

5. Claiming divine origin for its hypotheses, and hence divine character for their author.

We have also shown the so-called Christian Science repudiates the entire divine economy by either opposing, ignoring or explaining away hearing, faith, repentance, public profession, baptism and the eucharist; all divinely appointed means of grace. These divine commands are not only subjected to direct assault, but also to ridicule, sarcasm and a deliberate and insidious eliminative interpretation.

Reader, what say you to the so-called Christian Science hypotheses? Are they divine or diabolical in their origin? The author thereof and founder of the cult solemnly protests that they are not human. (See 457:1.)

III.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF ITS OWN PRECEPT AND PRACTICE—IS IT CONSISTENT?

III.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THE LIGHT OF ITS OWN PRECEPT AND PRACTICE—IS IT CONSISTENT?

Direct Antagonism Between Its Precept and Practice in Commonplace Matters—Inconsistency of Its Psychological Doctrines—Self-contradictory Teachings as to Its Purely Metaphysical Character—Conflicting Theories as to Cause and Cure of Disease and Disabilities—Repudiates Its Own Claim to Be Based on the Bible—Christian Science Relating to Sex—The Ten Counts in Our Indictment—Conclusion.

IN the chapters on Christian Science in the light of reason and revelation numerous quotations were made from its denominational text-book in proof of its denial of three propositions universally recognized as essential elements in every conclusion at which the human mind may arrive by logical process. A few sentences, therefore, will suffice to show that so-called Christian Science denies, emphatically and unqualifiedly:

1. The existence of matter.
2. The integrity of the five senses.
3. The reality of universally obvious phenomena.

421:18. "There is no Matter."

110:2. "All Science (C. S.) contradicts forever that matter can be actual."

477:11. "Christian Science . . . declares the corporeal senses to be mortal and erring illusions."

283:8. "Matter and its effects, sin, sickness and

death, are not facts. They are not ideas, but illusions."

Although our Christian Science friends so repeatedly, emphatically and categorically deny the existence of matter and the integrity of the senses, it can not have escaped the notice of even the superficial observer that it is in theory only; for they recognize the existence of matter by dealing with it just as others do; and they recognize the reliability of the five corporeal senses by trusting to them as implicitly for guidance in every act performed and every word spoken as do other people.

They recognize the reality of sin, sickness and death by committing sin perhaps no less frequently than others, by becoming sick, being disabled or injured by violence, and eventually yielding to death, just as do other people. Or if they yield to disease, injury or disability less readily or cling to life with more tenacity, it has not yet become obvious to those who prepare statistics and collate facts for the sanitary and mortuary tables.

Make a contract with a Scientist, and he will insist on delivery of the material goods or the payment of material money, just as will one professing to believe in their material character. Sell him an article, and he examines its quality by means of these senses which he believes to be solely "avenues and instruments of error," whose testimony is reversed by Christian Science "at every point." If it be food, he will inspect it with the same care by means of these futile senses, and insist on its containing the same material nutritive

and palatable elements as do other people. All this while he believes that

416:32. "Their bodies are sustained by Spirit, not matter." And

425:16. "Matter never sustained existence."

Assault our Christian Science friend and fracture a bone, and he will invoke the law, although he claims that

402:16. "No breakage or dislocation can really occur." And his own

397:15. "Thought is more potent to make the injury real than the violence itself."

He will testify that he saw you strike the blow, heard the concussion, felt the contusion and suffered pain from the injury; although his text-book teaches, and he asserts that these senses by which this knowledge was acquired, are

293:32. "Avenues and instruments of error."

213-16. "That their testimony is false." That they are

488:19. "Mortal beliefs, whose testimony can neither be true of man nor of his maker."

Without the proper arrangement of the material vocal organs, and a reliable sense of hearing, what effect would be produced by the well-groomed and richly clad speakers in the employ of the Mother Church who go to and fro proclaiming the attractive features of the Christian Science doctrines with such energy and emphasis, but are careful not to touch on the points which are being considered in this treatise? Without the proper arrangement of matter—paper, ink and type—where would be the

printed or written thesis, even the text-book of the cult? And without reliable sense of sight, to what use could it be put? Yet Christian Science denies the existence of the one and the reliability of the other. She is absolutely dependent on these two witnesses, Matter and Sensation, for evidence concerning each and every act, fact or conclusion imparted to a credulous public, yet she brands them both as being incompetent and incredible.

Our Christian Science friends disseminate their doctrines by means of paper, type and ink and vocal organs composed of matter which they assert does not exist; they sustain them by arguments which deny the basic postulate on which every logical conclusion must rest; and they ask us to take cognizance of them by means of the senses which they claim are incapable of transmitting any reliable impression. They base their claim to a favorable judgment on the very kind of evidence which they denounce as incompetent, incredible, futile.

To meet the exigencies of temperature our Christian Science friend resorts to the same means as do others. He dons his ulster or seeks artificially heated apartments in zero weather, and uses ice, shade and light clothing to mitigate the heat of summer. Why? His book teaches that

374:27. "Heat and cold are products of Mind."

If by exposure

384:9. "He incurs the penalty, it is but a mortal belief and man has only to enter his protest in order to annul it."

Our Scientist friend suffers the penalty of being

consumed by the devouring flame, scorched by the summer heat and chilled or frozen by zero temperature, just as we are if exposed thereto. Why does not he "enter his protest and annul it"?

He is absolutely dependent on food to sustain the body, although it is composed of matter which is non-existent; and although his book teaches

425:16. That "matter never sustained existence." And for nourishment

206:17. "Spirit, not matter is the source of supply."

He can not consistently eat or drink to gratify appetite nor to allay hunger and thirst, for

405:29. "The pains of sense are less harmful than its pleasures."

To maintain a wholesome temperature, renew the ever-wasting energies of the body, and to meet all the other exigencies of life, health, pleasure and utility, our Christian Science friend renders the same unreserved homage and implicit obedience to the mandates of sense as we do, while denouncing it as futile except for the purposes of falsehood and deception.

Why do not our Christian Science friends determine their conduct at the point of the convictions which they so emphatically assert? Why do they repudiate, so uniformly, in practice the doctrines they so confidently affirm in theory? There is—there can be—but one reason. *They are not sufficiently assured of their correctness to depend on them in the ordinary exigencies of life.* Their convictions are sufficiently intense to serve as a

cult basis, *but not as a principle by which to determine conduct.*

Why take precaution to avoid the impact of the onrushing locomotive or the flight of the frightened team?

209:1. "Man has a perfect, indestructible life."

402:16. "No breakage nor dislocation can really occur."

424:11. "Under divine providence there can be no accident."

402:17. "That accidents and injuries can kill a man is not true."

Even with the jugular vein severed,

122:24. "To spiritual sense and in *Science* life goes on unchanged."

These quotations are not predicated of a future life, as has been fully shown. But see 150:13; 232:16; 271:26; 282:1 and 374:14.

Nor does it appear that we will have jugular veins or other material organs in the future life, nor, if so, what will be their functions.

Do our Christian Science friends act in conformity to the doctrines which they so zealously and confidently proclaim? We all well know they do not. And why not? Simply because they fear the consequences. *He who refuses to conform his life to the convictions which he solemnly avows, thereby impeaches either his own intelligence or his own integrity.*

As to the doctrine of the unreality of sin, sickness and death, so-called Christian Science is equally inconsistent, whether considered in relation to its

other tenets or to the practice of its adherents.

283:8. "Sin, sickness and death are not facts. . . . They are not ideas, but illusions."

188:3. "What is termed disease does not exist."

417:11. "Mind is God, and therefore can not be sick; what is termed Matter can not be sick."

All concepts are classified under the heads of Mind, Matter and Force.

As force is but a quality or manifestation of either Mind or Matter, and possesses neither intelligence nor sensation, it can not be sick.

If, therefore, neither Mind, Matter nor Force can be sick, there can be no such thing as disease or disability.

As ruptures, fractures, lesions, contusions and abrasions are placed in the same category, and rest on the same principle, they are impossible.

But how are these passages to be reconciled with others in the text-book which treat disease, disability and death as serious realities?

147:15. S. & H. contains the complete Science of mind healing.

456:28. "Contains the whole of Science of healing through Mind."

109:11-27. The author spent years of self-denial, painful application, self-immolation and prayer in order to attain by divine revelation the secret of healing, which she has at great sacrifice given to the world. Her followers are engaged in disseminating her doctrines at immense expense and constant effort—and all for the sole purpose of combating that which is unreal—a myth, a man

of straw, a thing which "has no foundation in fact." 415:4.

The inspired formula for destroying this non-existent unreality has been committed to paper by type and ink composed of non-existent matter, and communicated to the perishing world by non-existent vocal organs through the medium of the five senses, all of which are incapable of transmitting reliable impressions; and last, but not least, it is emphasized by logical propositions having no basic postulate.

Although death is said to be "unreal," an "illusion," "a dream which comes with the night and disappears with the light," we read at

177:25. Swallowing poison will cause death.

379:25. "Fevers are errors of various types . . . pictures depicted by mortal mind on the body." Which,

380:1. "Unless destroyed by (C) Science, end in a belief called death."

Then any fever, typhoid, malarial, scarlet, spotted (cerebro spinal meningitis), no matter how mild or how malignant, *unless destroyed by* (Christian) *Science,* will end in *a belief called* death."

Any patient, then, suffering from any kind of fever (temperature above normal or 98 degrees Fahrenheit), no matter of what degree nor from what cause, must result in *"a belief called death,"* unless destroyed by Science, which in the Christian Science text-book means Christian Science. 127:9.

Notice the phrase, *"a belief called death."* But if death is but a belief, as taught all through the

text-book, how can one be subject to the one who repudiates the other? The two being identical, subjection to the one is contingent or dependent on acquiescence in the reality of the other. Therefore, before the Christian Scientist can commit sin, become sick or yield to death he must acquiesce in the belief of their reality. When he does this he repudiates the fundamental element, the chief corner-stone in the Christian Science doctrine; viz.: The unreality of universally obvious phenomena; for no phenomena are more universally obvious than sin, sickness and death. Thus every Christian Scientist,

> When he of sombre robe, relentless hand,
> And visage grim and ghastly, his demand
> Asserts,

repudiates the "chief corner-stone of his cherished doctrine" and accepts calmly the very opposite of that which he had so ardently and diligently proclaimed during his religious life.

227:20. "Christian Science raises the standard of liberty, and cries, Follow me! Escape the bondage of sin, sickness and death."

What would be thought of one running through a stone quarry at high speed during a drizzling rain beseeching people to flee from the impending flame, when there was not a spark of fire nor a particle of combustible material in sight? Or of one warning people to hasten to their caves and storm cellars for protection from an impending storm amidst a dead calm on a cloudless summer day?

Is it less inconsistent for so-called Christian

Science to expend countless millions and untold energy to induce people to fly for their lives and take refuge in her bosom from a myth, an illusion, an unreality, a mere belief without any foundation in truth, a mortal dream?

If sin, sickness and death are myths, illusions, mortal beliefs, with no foundation in truth, as the so-called Scientist professes to believe, being free from the belief, he should be free from the evil with which it is identical, for

184:6. "Belief produces the result of belief, and the penalty lasts as long, and is inseparable from it."

But if sin, disease and death are realities, and Christian Science constitutes the universal and infallible remedy

149:11. Which never varies. Is as certain as

233:25. "The quotient in division."

84:32. "More accurate than an astronomical calculation."

Why should not the same result be reached?

In theory our Christian Science friends have a divinely appointed, and hence infallible remedy for every ill, mental, spiritual and physical, to which the human family is subject. Knowledge requisite to success is neither extensive nor difficult of application. Because

329:4. "A little understanding of Christian Science proves the truth of all that I say of it." And as to its application,

462:16. "There is nothing difficult or toilsome in the task."

In practice, however, their advantage in curing, relieving or preventing disease and postponing death has been so near negligible as to have escaped the notice of those charged with the important task of obtaining and collating sanitary and mortuary statistics; and hence they have been ignored as factors in the life insurance equation by both the Government statistician and the great financial institutions of the country.

If results sustained the claim of our Christian Science friends that, as to them, sin, sickness and death are unreal; or that the doctrines constituted an infallible remedy therefor, immunity among its adherents ought to be wellnigh universal, and the most casual observer could not help noticing the fact. But such fact has not yet attracted the notice of those charged by the Government and the great financial institutions with the exercise of microscopic scrutiny along these lines.

And why? Simply because such claims are absolutely baseless.

They rest on no rational hypothesis, and are contradicted by universal experience.

An illusion is defined to be a false perception; a deception.

Therefore when the true perception is apprehended, the false one is destroyed. So, if sin, sickness and death are illusions—false perceptions —they can not possibly co-exist with the true perception of their character. The Christian Science text-book professes to contain, and our Christian Science friends profess to hold, the true perception,

and hence must of necessity be free from the false, the illusion, the reality—immune from these evils.

If the reality and the illusion are identical, must not he who is immune from the illusion also be immune from the reality? And must not he who is subject to the illusion be also subject to the reality?

472:26. "The only reality of sin, sickness and death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief."

If, therefore, there were a grain of truth in these Christian Science doctrines, it would result in the Christian Science adherent being always and wholly free from sin, sickness and death; and likewise that all who reject their doctrine would be always and wholly under their dominion.

Must not this be true in view of the following quotations?

149:11. The rule and its perfectness in (C) Science never vary."

274:22. "Divine (Christian) Science is absolute, and permits no half-way position in learning the principle and establishing the rule by demonstration."

Ask the Christian Science practitioner to restore an amputated limb or give you a definite formula therefor, and will he do it? You know he will not. Yet he claims that this is within the power of Christian Science teaching. 212:5.

As easily as Nature restores the lobster's claw. 489:2-8.

And with only "a little understanding of Christian Science doctrines." 329:4.

Our Christian Science friends say that the rule and its perfectness never vary. 149:11. That it can be known "more accurately than an astronomer can calculate an eclipse," and is as certain as a syllogism or an accurately stated sum in arithmetic. 192:2. It requires but "a little understanding" of the Christian Science doctrines in order to demonstrate its inerrancy. 329:4; and is neither difficult nor toilsome of application. 462:16.

What would be thought of a system of logic or mathematics the founder and advocates of which refused a single public demonstration in answer to the demands of an anxious, inquiring and unprejudiced public?

It would be said that the system itself was a fraud or its advocates impostors; perhaps both. Claiming absolute perfection—inerrancy, divine infallibility—for their system, our Christian Science friends refuse to give a public demonstration or cite a single well-authenticated case of extraordinary cure under conditions rendering imposture or mistake impossible, or even improbable. Is this consistent?

There is another principle asserted with equal emphasis and without qualification in one part of the text-book, and as positively and emphatically denied, both in theory and practice, in another. It is the purely mental or metaphysical character of the system.

453:29. "A Christian Scientist's medicine is Mind."

421:27. "You should not build it (disease) up by . . . making a single material application for its relief."

445:7. "Teach the fatal effect of dwarfing spiritual understanding by recourse to material means for healing."

459:16. "It is like arming a maniac or blind man with a sharp knife and turning him loose in the streets of a crowded city."

483:5. "We classify disease as error which nothing but Mind can heal."

402:2. "Christian Science is always the most skilful surgeon."

459:31. "The Scientist" never recommends hygiene nor manipulates.

Numerous passages in the text-book show the Christian Science system to be exclusively mental, and that all material means for the relief of both injuries or disease are repudiated.

348:9. "One disease is as much a delusion as another."

But how do these propositions consist with recommendations of an entirely different character appearing in other parts of the book?

401:29. "Until the advancing age *admits* the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon."

But why does any part of a divinely infallible system for healing have to be postponed till the

advancing age admits its efficacy? Is Divine Mind, Infinite All-power, less skillful in surgery than in chemistry and *materia medica?* Certainly not, since it can restore the amputated limb as easily as the sensation of pain can return, or as readily as Nature restores the lobster's claw. 212:5 and 489:2-8. Why is this important branch of the healing art dependent for success on the acquiescence of "the advancing age"?

Would not a demonstration that it is "neither difficult nor toilsome"; "may be known more accurately than an astronomer can calculate an eclipse," and as certain as a mathematical problem, assist in *advancing* the age to that plane of intelligence and efficiency so desirable in relieving human suffering?

Christian Science teaches that

159:30. "Man's belief produces disease and all its symptoms."

194:6. "A change in belief changes all the physical symptoms."

385:27. "The opposite belief would produce the opposite result."

145:10. "Truth subdues the human belief in disease," and recovery will come to the patient.

Wounds from accident or violence are produced in the same way and are the result of the same cause, belief.

397:14. "When an accident happens, . . . your thought is more potent, . . . than the accident itself, to make the injury real."

So we see that wounds, fractures, abrasions, con-

tusions, dislocations, and all other cases requiring surgical attention, are placed by Christian Science on exactly the same basis, attributed to the same cause and subjected to the same treatment, as disease. They are said to be curable by "mental surgery alone" (402:4-9); viz.: change of belief. 155:1-8.

If, then, they are due to the same cause—belief in their reality—and yield to the same treatment—belief in their unreality—if the one must be postponed "till the advancing age admits" its efficacy, so must the other. Because

184:6. "Belief (in the reality of disease) produces the results of belief (reality) and the penalty (reality) lasts as long as the belief, and is inseparable from it."

Why does the founder of Christian Science draw, and its adherents acquiesce in, a distinction between medicine and surgery which is based on no principle, but in direct conflict with the fundamentals of the text-book? We need not go far to find the answer. Conditions requiring surgery are usually readily ascertained immediately after, if not before, operating; results appear so quickly and success or failure is so obvious, and their cause so apparent, that little chance is left for deception, that prime factor in so many systems of mental therapeutics. Modern surgery had been recently placed on so purely a scientific basis, its principles so accurately ascertained, and its practice attended with such phenomenal success, that some reason had to be assigned for the conspicuous and

universal failures of the metaphysicians, or all claim of virtue in their system had to be abandoned. They give no case where competent, reliable and disinterested judges have duly ascertained the malady to have been structural in character, malignant in type and the sequence of healing obvious or even probable.

We quote once more from the text-book to show that we have neither perverted nor exaggerated the claims of our Christian Science friends in regard to structural deformities. A pre-natal deformity in one thirty years old

178:12. "Is not more difficult to cure: for we wrest it from human mind and base the cure on Divine Mind, to which all things are possible."

Why should a system capable of removing pre-natal deformities, restoring lost limbs and other organs, and keeping life unchanged with the jugular severed, abandon this important branch of the healing art to physical means—methods of human or mortal mind—not only futile, but as disastrous as "arming a maniac with a sharp knife, and turning him loose in the crowded streets of a city"? See 459:16.

We quote a single sentence bristling with points obviously and inexplicably inconsistent with Christian Science fundamentals as set forth in the book.

464:14. "If from an injury or any cause a Christian Scientist were seized with pain so violent that he could not treat himself mentally,—and the Scientists had failed to relieve him,—he could call a surgeon to give him a hypodermic injection."

A pain is a symptom indicating an abnormal, distressed condition of that part of the body in which it is located; hence, without material organs or parts there could be no location, hence no pain. Pain is communicated to the mind by the sense of touch or feeling, which Christian Science declares is futile, incapable of transmitting any reliable information to the human mind. Here, then, the founder of the cult admits the falsity of the first two fundamentals of Christian Science; viz.: the non-existence of Matter, and the futility of sensation; for any accurate recognition of real pain involves the existence of material organs or parts in which the pain is located, as well as the absolute integrity of the sense of touch by which the sensation is communicated.

But how can pain prevent mental treatment? If mind is well, how can the Scientist's body, which is "but a false concept" (177:10), prevent its action? For Mind is never sick or disabled. 417:11; 393:29. And,

385:20. "Mind determines whether the flesh shall be painful, swollen or discolored."

Christian Science teaches that supremacy of mind brings immunity from disease and disability of all kinds; also that the true Scientist holds that supremacy of mind. But in this short sentence it is conceded that Mind, though supreme, is impotent until opiates, narcotics or anesthetics have reduced pain, which is but one of the symptoms of disease.

By the direct admission of the author, the great

therapeutic agency of the cult is paralyzed in the Scientist sufferer and his Scientist fellows until the surgeon who is not a Scientist administers the "inanimate drug," which has no healing power, and the use of which constitutes an "impeachment of God's method." 463:29 and 202:26-30.

Here the sufferer is a Scientist, who should be immune from pain, because free from the illusion with which it is identical. His attendant practitioners are Scientists, who profess to have the divinely appointed and infallible remedy, not only for the pain itself, but for the malady of which it is but a symptom. Yet failure is acknowledged and an injection is recommended of a drug which possesses no virtue, and by a surgeon whose system is not only futile, but fraught with all the frightful consequences of "arming a maniac with a sharp knife and turning him loose in the crowded streets of a city." Being impotent to allay the pain, which is but a symptom, on what principle may Christian Science treatment claim infallibility in preventing and destroying disease itself? But Christian Science says:

159:30. "Belief produces disease and all its symptoms." And

184:6. "The penalty (result) of belief lasts as long, and is inseparable from it."

But how can one who understands and avoids the cause (belief) of an evil (disease), and is in charge of, and being treated by experts, who also understand and avoid the cause; how can such a one be subject to and suffer from the effect of

such cause, the disease? Much more, how can such a one be dependent for relief therefrom on those who do not understand, and hence do not even profess or attempt to avoid the cause?

The so-called Scientist fully understands and avoids the cause (belief), yet he suffers from the effect. He has the divinely appointed infallible and easily applied remedy, which, under the direction of himself and fellow-expert practitioners, proves a failure. He is then recommended to apply for and obtain relief from those who are ignorant of the cause, and hence make no effort to avoid it; and also, to submit to treatment which is not only useless, futile, God-dishonoring, but as dangerous to the patient as would be to the crowds in a city street, a maniac armed with a sharp knife. The writer of these pages can not conceive of doctrines more obviously antithetic or irreconcilably conflicting. It is tantamount to saying that he who knows and avoids the cause is more liable to experience the effect than he who does neither. Could a proposition be more anomalous?

In so-called Christian Science teaching the healing power is, in various places, attributed to numerous and variant agencies. But the author has not seen fit to so classify the maladies or the agencies as to indicate what particular agency is adapted to each particular malady; nor has she explained the underlying principle so that the practitioner or the patient may be enabled to determine for himself.

From the language used, 296:30 to 297:10 of the text-book the inference seems obvious that any

physical condition of the body will be produced when suggested by belief; and from 145:10, that disease can only be cured by subduing human belief therein.

194:6. "A change of belief changes all the physical symptoms."

184:6. "The penalty (result) of belief is inseparable from it."

Here it clearly appears that it is a belief in *the reality of disease* itself which is productive thereof. In other words, disease is superinduced by, dependent on, co-existent with, and inseparable from a belief in its own reality.

149:11. "The rule and its perfectness of operation in Science never vary."

So, we see that it is the mental attitude toward disease—the assent or dissent to its reality or unreality—which produces and cures it.

And the principle is by Christian Science applied equally to fractures, dislocations, dismemberments, wounds and injuries from violence or accident.

154:30. "Thought governs wounds and injuries from violence, as well as disease."

397:15. "When an accident happens, . . . your thought is more potent than the accident itself to make the injury real."

It likewise applies the principle to reconstructive processes in healing.

422:18. "The changes which go on in mortal mind serve to reconstruct the body."

425:23. "Consciousness constructs a better body when you have conquered faith in Matter."

Nor does it stop here, but claims that moral and spiritual ailments are dependent on the same principle and respond to the same process.

404:27. "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same in C. S., require the same method,—inseparable in truth."

We see, then, that the Christian Science system of treatment ignores all distinction between abnormal human conditions; moral, spiritual and physical; and among physical conditions all distinction between the functional, organic and structural or mechanical. Their cause and cure depends on our mental attitude toward the reality of the malady and our confidence in the remedy, rather than any curative power or virtue in either the treatment or manner of administering it.

If, in the phenomena of healing, moral, spiritual and physical, including the mechanical and structural, mental attitude can supply the link of causation between objects and conditions not otherwise or previously related, on what principle are we to exclude its controlling influence from the realms of inorganic mechanics, mathematics and chemistry?

The escape of blood through a paralyzed or atrophied heart-valve, or from a ruptured vein or artery, is no more mechanical than is the flow of water through a crevasse in the banks of a stream.

Action of the acids on the metals in an electric battery is no more chemical than is the action of an alkaloid poison on the mucous membrane of the human stomach. The filling of the hull of a dis-

abled ship, thereby causing it to sink, is no more dependent on lapse of time than is the filling of the human lungs, thereby causing one to drown; nor is the expelling the water from the vessel's hull, and causing to refloat, any more mechanical than is expelling the same element from the human lungs, thereby bringing resuscitation. If, then, the Scientist can accomplish the one, why not the other? Simply because the only influence which mind has, or can exert, over matter in the accomplishment of any beneficent purpose, must be *through physical force intelligently directed.*

The doctrine of supremacy of mind over matter independent of application by physical force is a dangerous one; and the author of "Science and Health," in her effort to avoid the ditch of error on the one side, has plunged headlong into the abyss of inconsistency on the other.

In attempting to explain how poison inadvertently taken could produce death if such effect depended on belief, the founder of Christian Science said:

177:26. "Death comes from belief as if intentionally taken." But

178:5. "The result comes from the belief of the majority outside, not from that of the minority inside the death chamber."

155:5. "When the sick recover by use of drugs it is the general belief culminating in the individual faith which heals; and according to this individual faith (belief) will the effect be."

155:10. "The druggist, physician, the nurse,

equip the medicine with their individual beliefs; and they of the majority prevail."

It is, then, the mental attitude toward the remedy proposed, rather than any virtue in the remedy itself, which causes the cure. The "inanimate drug," which is impotent, and the use of which constitutes "an impeachment of God's power"; and which is fraught with all the fearful consequences of "arming a maniac with a sharp knife, and turning him loose in the streets of a crowded city," is just as potent to heal, *if equipped* with the individual faith of the druggist, doctor and nurse, and sustained by a majority outside the sick chamber, as is "infinite All-power" divine Science, "which the author reduced to human apprehension and named *Christian Science.*" (See 471 : 29.)

If so-called Christian Science has no power to cure except when believed, and any other treatment is equally potent under like conditions, where is the advantage? That it actually has no more power than other systems under like conditions, is an unavoidable inference and obvious conclusion from the foregoing quotations from the Christian Science text-book prepared by the founder, circulated by the Mother Church and sanctioned by the adherents of the cult everywhere.

Though the Christian Science text-book asserts with confidence—yea, dogmatism—that both disease and its cure are the result of belief, it does not attempt to point out by whom the belief must be held in each particular case; nor why it must be

held by the patient in one case, by those about him in another, and by a majority of those at a distance in still another.

376:20. "The efficient remedy (for fever) is to destroy the *patient's* unfortunate belief."

412:20. "Argue with your patient that he is not sick."

411:32. "If you succeed in removing fear (belief in the reality) your patient is healed."

From these cases it appears that it is the belief of the *patient* in the reality of the malady which constitutes its cause, and his belief in its unreality which produces its cure.

413:31. "A child can have worms if *you* say so, or any other malady held in belief by *those about him.*"

Here it is the *belief of those about him.* But in the case of one who swallows poison without knowing its character, it is

178:5. "The *majority outside,* not the minority inside the death room."

But in the case of one who is benefited by medicine, it is

155:10. *"The chemist, druggist, doctor, nurse,* who equip their medicine with their faith, and the *beliefs that are in the majority rule."*

So we see that Christian Science, divine Mind—infinite All-power—has delegated the healing power to three different, probably conflicting, and possibly diametrically opposite, agencies. When each is being exerted with that irresistible force requisite to the infallibility claimed for the Christian Science

system, what will become of the poor victim's body? Suppose the patient is wholly unconscious, so that he has no belief and is incapable of forming one. Suppose the Christian Science practitioners present for treatment believe he has typhoid fever, but that it is unreal—an illusion, as is all disease; and suppose that the majority outside the sick-room do not know anything about it, or are informed that he is bleeding to death from a wound. Which belief will prevail? The number, proximity and degree of intensity necessary to inoculate the child with internal parasites as above suggested, and the means for counteracting the effect, would be interesting; but the text-book does not contain this important information.

But what majority, and of whom must it consist outside the sick-room in order to control disease by belief? Must it be a majority of all the people of the world? Of every class and age? If not, what part? Must it be of some particular class, or of some locality? Must it consist of those bearing some relationship of blood, ties, social or religious, to be patient? How are we to obtain the necessary consensus of opinion, unless we are informed as to where and of what class it must consist? Will some Christian Science friend inform us? Here is important information not contained in the text-book, with all its claims for infallibility, perfection and divine origin.

We next observe that in many places in the Christian Science text-book the healing power is attributed to Truth.

229:31. "The remedy for sickness is always truth."

191:31. "Truth is able to cast out all the ills of the flesh."

318:23. "The Science of Mind treats disease as error and heals with Truth."

371:31. "Truth is an alterative of the entire system, and can make it every whit whole."

We unhesitatingly acknowledge that Truth, so definitely ascertained as to be available, so accurately classified as to be readily adapted to the purpose in hand, and so intelligently applied as to be effective, will enable man to carry out any design within the range of human wisdom and skill. That there are feats—perhaps diseases—absolutely beyond human control, I doubt not; and that there are others within the range of possibility, the truth relative to which has not yet been sufficiently ascertained, classified and rendered practicable to place them within the range of human skill and strength, is also doubtless true. But that truth—abstract truth—undiscovered, unclassified and unapplied through material means can be all-powerful in curing disease, or of even contributing to the ever-present, reconstructive and recuperative agencies of Nature in relieving them, we deny. Abstract or theoretical truth, independent of all material agencies, never did, and never will change the character, condition or location of a single physical object; and we are justified in assuming that this is the kind of truth meant by the author of the text-book, for she condemns unsparingly all

material means of treating disease. We quote:

453:30. Christian Science is mind. Never resorts to hygiene or manipulates.

463:28. The Christian Science law of healing spiritual, not material.

463:29. "The sick are not healed by the inanimate drug."

459:12. "Any attempt to heal with mortal mind (material means) must prove abortive."

421:29. A single material application tends to aggravate disease.

So the direct statements of the text-book itself force us to the conclusion that when cures are attributed to Truth, it means truth dissociated from and independent of all material means and methods.

But suppose it is conceded that the author meant practical truth, intelligently applied; what truth, or phase thereof, is requisite to the cure of disease? Not *all* truth, for much remains undiscovered. The practitioner may hold much truth which bears no possible relation to the patient's condition, and be wholly ignorant of all which does.

Will that avail? Certainly not. Will a historical or chronological truth cure a structural or organic malady? Any good resulting from truth indiscriminately applied is purely accidental; while the chances of its working harm are infinitely greater. The only kind of truth which can possibly relieve or cure any kind of disease or disability is that special phase, or group of phases, which bears some remedial relation to the particular abnormal condition of the particular organ or member affected.

True Science assumes the function of discovering truth and classifying it by ascertaining and defining its relation to every conceivable object and condition, so that one may be applied to the other with certain effect. He who struggles with a difficult problem needs that especial phase of truth which is adapted to its solution; and no other can serve his purpose, though equal in verity and infinitely greater in importance. Here so-called Christian Science utterly fails. It makes no discrimination between the adapted and the unadapted truth. It advocates truth! truth!! without discrimination as the sovereign remedy for all human ills; and by implication so strong as to be conclusive, teaches that any psychological truth will solve every conceivable sanitary and structural problem which may involve the human body. In this it is vague, conjectural, inexplicable, contradictory.

Thus does Christian Science trifle with Truth by a word-play on the term itself, and in a manner not possible to be reconciled with its general teachings.

Christian Science defines error as "the opposite of truth, hence the opposite of God"; a "coward before Truth," and as having no real existence. 287:23; 368:6. It also says:

202:15. "All outside Christian Science is unstable error."

545-18. "Outside Christian Science all is the opposite of Truth."

All material remedies and means for healing are "outside the Christian Science system," because

not included, but unsparingly condemned therein. Hence they are all "unstable error."

But material means are placed on the same footing, conceded exactly the same power, on exactly the same principle in healing as is Christian Science, divine Mind, infinite All-power; viz.: on condition that they are sustained by belief.

155:5. "When the sick recover by the use of drugs it is the general belief culminating in the individual faith; and according to this faith will (not may) the effect be."

155:10. "The chemist, druggist, doctor and nurse equip their medicine with their faith, and the beliefs of the majority rule."

177:25. "If one takes poison by mistake it is human belief that causes death as directly as if intentionally taken."

178:5. "But it is the belief of the majority outside the sick room, rather than the minority inside."

So we see that Error, the skulking coward, is as able to heal as is Christian Science, divine Science, divine Mind, infinite All-power, if equipped with the beliefs of the majority; and no more is claimed for Truth. Moreover, Infallible Truth, Divine Mind, Divine Science, which the author reduced to human apprehension and called it Christian Science (471:29), stands helpless in the sick-room with the patient surrounded by devout and expert Christian Science practitioners, *if outnumbered by opposing beliefs on the outside.* Obviously, if these last four quotations are statements of truth, Error is the

champion and Truth, the invincible, is the vanquished.

Another glaring inconsistency appearing in the Christian Science text-book is the confusion of the functions of Divine Mind and Mortal Mind.

All through the book the terms Divine Mind, Divine Science and Christian Science are used interchangeably (127:9), and are used to denote infinity in knowledge, power and infallibility. Mortal Mind is used in a sense diametrically opposite. It is described as the source of all error, distress, disease and impotency.

592:3. "It is the opposite of spirit, hence the opposite of God."

174:30. "The cause of disease obtains therein."

274:17. "The five (futile) senses are but manifest beliefs thereof."

Though the source of all confusion, error and disease, it is said that

228:5. "Nothing inharmonious can enter it."

459:12. "Any attempt to heal with *erring mortal mind,* . . . is like arming a maniac with a sharp knife and turning him loose in a crowded street."

Reader, did you know that *mortal mind,* the personification of the evil spirit and all that is bad, just as God is the embodiment of all that is good —this Mortal Mind is the exclusive custodian of the body, furnishes the sole motive power for the diaphragm and cardiac muscles which keep the heart and lungs in action while volition is suspended by sleep? So-called Christian Science so states. We quote:

187:13. "The valves of the heart obey the mandate of mortal mind as directly as does the hand, moved evidently by the will."

220:30. "Mortal mind forms all the conditions of the body, controls the stomach, lungs, bones, heart and blood as directly as volition moves the hand."

422:18. "The changes which go on (are suggested or inaugurated) in mortal mind serve to reconstruct the body."

402:14. "Mortal mind constructs the body of its own materials."

Then the statement that God formed the human body is a mistake. Not only are the energy and materials requisite to the original creation of the human body all furnished solely by mortal mind; but also those necessary for its reconstruction and recuperation when disabled, depleted and exhausted. They are all furnished by Mortal Mind, which is, in the text-book of the cult, defined as "Nothing, claiming to be something; mythology; the opposite of spirit, therefore the opposite of God; sin; sickness; death." (See 591:25 to 592:10.)

But for the student of natural science who has given but a superficial consideration to the tenets of this peculiar cult, perhaps the greatest surprise is yet in store. One of the most positively asserted and universally emphasized claims of Christian Science is its superior system of morals inherent in doctrine and exemplified in its votaries. Its literature, from the theses of its Great High Priestess to the contributions of its most inexperienced

neophyte, will be found bristling with variant phases of this claim.

The writer of these pages does not believe this claim is sustained.

He does believe that Christian Science contains the germs of a system which, if carried to its legitimate results, will tend to destroy the very bulwarks which modern society has erected against social impurity.

305:13. "Gender is a quality, a characteristic of mortal mind, not matter."

508:13. "Gender consists of Mind, not matter."

These statements might seem a little indefinite were it not for the fact that the text-book teaches, as we have already shown, that in disease, disability and dismemberment the structural condition of the human body is due solely to the mental attitude which we assume thereto. With this fact in mind we are amply justified in assuming that it is here also meant that gender or sex is dependent on metal attitude rather than structural conformity.

What can be more destructive of sex modesty than the idea that sex consists simply of the attitude which we mentally assume rather than a structural difference?

But Christian Science also teaches that the organs of sex are unnecessary for the preservation of the human race.

From 302:32 to 303:8 we learn through a somewhat ambiguous statement that reproduction in Christian Science is by Spirit, not matter; and we

might suppose that it was restricted to spiritual things were it not so reiterated as to forbid such restriction.

531:32. "Did God first create one man, Adam, and then require the union of the sexes to create the rest of the human race? No."

In an argument to prove the falsity of Gen. 3: 11, 12, the author says:

533:16. "According to this belief, the rib taken from Adam's side has grown into an evil mind named *woman,* who aids man to make sinners more rapidly than he could alone."

Sex, then, is an illusion, a myth, a mental figment; it bears no relation to propagation, and hence is charged with no function of utility. This being true, perversion of sex becomes impossible. It can not possibly bring evil physical consequences, for disease and disability are illusions, unrealities; nor can it involve sin, for that is an illusion, an unreality which man is incapable of committing.

480:19. "God could never make man capable of sin."

472:26. "The only reality of sin, sickness and death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief."

They are all superinduced by, dependent on and inseparable from belief—mental attitude. 184:6. Change the mental attitude (belief), and the sin or malady is gone. For

385:29. "The opposite belief (mental attitude) would produce the opposite result."

Therefore, if a thing appears sinful, all that is

necessary is change of mental attitude—assume the attitude of belief in its unreality.

This is the Christian Science way of curing disease, and

406:3. "Sin and sickness are both healed by the same principle."

404:27. "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same in Christian Science. Both cures require the same method, and inseparable in Truth."

Reader, are these the basic principles on which to erect the superstructure of social purity? Surely not. On the contrary, they sweep away every social, physical and spiritual bulwark which Virtue can erect for her own defense.

That so-called Christian Scientists are, in general, immodest, lewd or unchaste, the writer of these pages does not pretend to assert; for he has no data from which to draw such conclusion with any degree of certainty.

But should some new prophet arise who is disposed to lay special emphasis on this peculiar phase of Christian Science didactics, the foregoing propositions would furnish a powerful and plausible weapon with which to beat down the forces which stand for social purity.

That this most unwholesome and insidious doctrine should be kept out of prominence during the formative period of public sentiment as to the merit of the cult tenets is but natural. All religious societies refrain from emphasizing their vicious and objectionable features till such numerical strength

has been attained as will encourage a defiance of public sentiment.

A most glaring inconsistency of Christian Science is obvious in its attitude toward the Bible. In theory it pretends to be based on, and in perfect harmony with, its prophecy, its history and its didactics.

497:3. "As adherents to truth, we take the inspired word of the Bible as our sufficient guide to eternal life."

In practice, however, it denounces a part thereof as deliberate falsehood.

521:26. "The second chapter of Genesis contains a statement, . . . which is the exact opposite of Truth."

523:6. "The lie claims to be truth, when presenting the exact opposite of Truth." Other parts are described as being

522:24. "Based on some hypothesis of error."

Chapter is arrayed against chapter, and verse against verse, as being in direct antagonism to each other.

522:3. "The Science of the first (chapter of Genesis) proves the incorrectness of the second, for they are antagonistic."

Still other parts are assailed with a sarcastic humor unexcelled by a Renan, a Voltaire or a Paine.

531:32. "Did God create one man unaided, but afterward require the union of the sexes to create the rest of the human family? No."

533:16. "According to this belief a rib taken

from Adam's side has grown to an evil mind named woman, who aids man to make sinners more rapidly than he could alone."

And finally, it denies the death of Jesus Christ, which constitutes the foundation—the chief corner-stone—on which the whole superstructure of modern Christianity rests.

44:28. "His disciples believed Jesus dead while he was hidden in the sepulchre; whereas he was alive."

46:2. "They saw him after his crucifixion, and learned that he had not died."

Every book of the Old Testament, with the inerrant finger of prophecy in fact, figure and symbol, points forward to the vicarious death of the world's Messiah. The first four books of the New Testament present the cotemporary history of its preparation and consummation; and all the others point backward to that one superlative fact with all the infallible precision of a magnetic needle to the pole.

Yet so-called Christian Science arrogantly and unblushingly denies this fact of all facts, without which modern Christianity is as impotent and as purposeless as is the derelict in mid-ocean amidst the blackness of night and the fury of storm without rudder, chart or compass.

Reader, have we sustained our indictment against Christian Science as being in gross and irreconcilable conflict with its own precept and practice? We arraign her and charge her with being guilty on the following counts:

1. Denying the existence of Matter, while using it in perfect confidence as the sole receptacle for her sacred oracles. In the form of type, paper, ink and leather, Matter constitutes the exclusive custodian of the Christian Science doctrines, and no one questions her fidelity to the trust of keeping them intact.

2. Asserting the absolute futility of the five senses, though making them the exclusive vehicles for disseminating its doctrines in the confident assurance that this duty will be faithfully and inerrantly performed.

Also in yielding implicit obedience to their mandates and suggestion as readily as do those who assert their absolute integrity.

3. Asserting the illusive character, the unreality of sin, while its adherents transgress the divine, the natural and the municipal laws with the same facility and as little compunction as do others.

4. Asserting that the only reality in disease and disability consists of the belief therein, they persist in suffering the penalty while repudiating the belief. In practice they thus assert the effect while denying the only adequate cause.

5. Asserting that death is an illusion, superinduced by, dependent on and inseparable from a belief in its reality; hence it is powerless over those who refuse to acknowledge its power. They are all, however, forced to yield to its claims, though at the same time refusing to acknowledge its potency. In practice they concede the reality of

that which in theory they believe to be unreal.

6. It claims to constitute a divinely appointed and infallible system for the cure of every human ill of body, mind and character; easy to be learned and applied without difficulty; yet it declines to give public demonstrations or show a single case of a substantial malady where causation was logically traced between treatment and recovery. Nor is it shown that they who know and practice this infallible system suffer less from disease than those who are ignorant thereof, and hence do not observe its requirements.

7. Denouncing all material means of treatment as both futile and dangerous, it shows them to be equal in some cases to its own divinely infallible system, and superior thereto in others.

8. Asserting the exclusively divine character of the healing process, and the futility of all human means, it enjoins on its practitioners the duty of exacting tribute from its patrons for invoking and directing forces over which it has no control.

9. Professing to be based on, and in perfect harmony with, the Bible, it denounces some of its teachings as error, some as unblushing falsehood, and devitalizes the remainder by an insidious and plausibly arranged emasculative interpretation. And finally

10. It claims an exclusive superiority for its system of morals, although it has equipped the assailant of social purity with a ready and powerful weapon of refutation against every plea which Virtue may invoke in her own defense.

Which one of these counts have we failed to sustain by evidence so overwhelmingly preponderant as to exclude even the possibility of a doubt? And every item of that evidence is taken from the lips and pen of the Great Founder, Prophet, Priestess and Oracle of the cult itself.

Jury of the Vicinage, what is your verdict? Guilty or not guilty?

THE END.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BP955 .C785
Christian Science in the light of reason
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00080 9519